June 17, 2015 – Wednesday

Times noted are estimated. Items in bold are CAC member-requested presentations.

1. Pledge of Allegiance

2. Roll Call

3. Approval of Meeting Minutes of May 20, 2015

4. Public Comment (5:50 p.m.)
   Public testimony by each individual speaker shall be limited to three minutes

5. Committee Comments (6:00 p.m.)
   Committee members may make brief statements regarding CAC-related areas of concern, ideas for improvement, or other items that will benefit or impact Caltrain service or the CAC, or request future agenda topics

6. Chairperson’s Report (6:10 p.m.)

7. Subcommittee Report: Amendment to Bylaws:
   Article II – Officers, Section 1; Article III – Meetings,
   Sections 1 and 3 (Adina Levin, Yvonne Mills, Brian Shaw) (6:15 p.m.)

8. Presentation on Schedule Coordination with the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (Kermit Cuff) (6:25 p.m.)

9. Caltrain Modernization Program Update – Presentation on Electric Multiple Unit Procurement – Seats/Standees/Bikes/Bathrooms Balance (Casey Fromson) (6:40 p.m.)

10. Presentation on the Annual Caltrain Passenger Counts (April Maguigad) (7:25 p.m.)

11. Staff Report (April Maguigad) (7:40 p.m.)
   a. Follow-up Report
   b. 2015 JPB CAC Work Plan

12. Date, Time and Place of Next Meeting
   July 15, 2015 at 5:40 p.m., San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building, 2nd Floor Bacciocco Auditorium, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA

13. Adjournment

CAC MEMBERS: San Francisco City & County: Jonathan Berk, Brian Shaw, Alex Sweet (Vice Chair)
San Mateo County: Chris Cobey (Chair), Annie Lee, Adina Levin
Santa Clara County: Yvonne Mills, Greg Scharff, Cat Tucker
INFORMATION TO THE PUBLIC

If you have questions on the agenda, please contact the Assistant District Secretary at 650.508.6223 or cacsecretary@caltrain.com. Agendas are available on the Caltrain Web site at http://www.caltrain.com.

JPB and Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting schedules are available on the Caltrain Web site.

Location, Date and Time of Regular Meetings
Regular meetings are held at the San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building located at 1250 San Carlos Ave., San Carlos, CA, which is located one block west of the San Carlos Caltrain Station on El Camino Real. The office is also accessible by SamTrans bus routes ECR, FLX, 260, 295 and 398. Additional transit information can be obtained by calling 1.800.660.4287 (TTY 650.508.6448) or 511.

The JPB Citizens Advisory Committee meets regularly on the third Wednesday of the month at 5:40 p.m. at the same location. Date, time and place may change as necessary.

Public Comment
If you wish to address the Committee, please fill out a speaker’s card located on the agenda table and hand it to the Assistant District Secretary. If you have anything that you wish distributed to the Committee and included for the official record, please hand it to the Assistant District Secretary, who will distribute the information to the Committee members and staff.

Members of the public may address the Committee on non-agendized items under the Public Comment item on the agenda. Public testimony by each individual speaker shall be limited to three minutes and items raised that require a response will be deferred for staff reply.

Accessibility for Individuals with Disabilities
Upon request, the JPB will provide for written agenda materials in appropriate alternative formats, or disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, to enable individuals with disabilities to participate in public meetings. Please send a written request, including your name, mailing address, phone number and brief description of the requested materials and a preferred alternative format or auxiliary aid or service at least two days before the meeting. Requests should be mailed to Assistant District Secretary at Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070-1306; or emailed to cacsecretary@caltrain.com; or by phone at 650.508.6279, or TTY 650.508.6448.

Availability of Public Records
All public records relating to an open session item on this agenda, which are not exempt from disclosure pursuant to the California Public Records Act, that are distributed to a majority of the legislative body will be available for public inspection at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070-1306, at the same time that public records are distributed or made available to the legislative body.
MEMBERS PRESENT: J. Berk, C. Cobey (Chair), A. Levin, B. Shaw, A. Sweet, G. Scharff

MEMBERS ABSENT: A. Lee, Y. Mills, C. Tucker

STAFF PRESENT: J. Averill, D. Couch, C. Fromson, A. Ly, A. Maguigad

Chair Chris Cobey called the meeting to order at 5:42 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF APRIL 15, 2015
Motion/Second: Shaw/Sweet
Ayes: Berk, Cobey, Levin, Shaw, Sweet, Scharff
Absent: Lee, Mills, Tucker

PUBLIC COMMENT
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said the new Metrolink cars are on the trains. Now capacity is met, but capacity will continue to grow, and bicyclists will want more bike space. He suggested gutting the seats out of the bike cars to provide 80 bike spaces on trains, and if people want to watch their bikes, they should stand.

Doug DeLong, Mountain View, congratulated the JPB and Transit America Services, Inc. for getting the new Metrolink cars into service. He said this just buys time between now and electrification because demand will continue to grow. The schedule is being stressed by the passenger loads. Capacity can be created by eliminating stops on average, and the schedule should be redesigned to spread out the stops and create similar speed for all trains. Caltrain could run a group of three trains every 30 minutes. This could provide more seat miles per hour, seat more customers and make the schedule more reliable.

Jeff Carter, Millbrae, said he does not agree to eliminate stops because it is a deterrent to using Caltrain and is an inconvenience to station pairs.

COMMITTEE COMMENTS
Brian Shaw thanked the JPB for the new cars and said they are a good stopgap measure for the meantime. He said trains should be better labeled on the sides with their train number and perhaps the stops they make.

Jonathan Berk said the design of the schedule should be an absolute focus that requires analysis. He said it requires a serious investment because the trains are full. He
said the customers being served come in late and work late. He said the optimal train service that can be provided given the constraints Caltrain has should be determined. The objective should be defined, which could be to get the most cars off the road, increase the revenue, or increase customers.

Adina Levin asked if schedule refinements are in the work plan and if Caltrain is planning to change the schedule between now and electrification. April Maguigad, Manager, Rail Operations, said how service levels are decided, when changes are made, and what factors are involved are in the work plan. She said there will be changes between now and 2020 but none are planned at this time.

Greg Scharff said the schedule issue is very important. He said it is important to know how much it costs to run more express trains, and to know what is feasible and what can be accomplished given the limited resources.

Alex Sweet said Bike Share is proposing to remove all bike share systems on the Peninsula except for San Jose. She said this is a terrible idea given the goals Caltrain has to move people, accommodate people with bikes and reduce demand for bikes onboard. She encouraged Caltrain to reach out to cities on the Peninsula to voice support for continuing Bike Share and expanding the program.

Mr. Scharff encouraged Caltrain to reach out to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), because they will be making the decision. It is critical for cities to have the Bike Share Program.

Public Comment
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said he found $10 million to $16 million of pork in the operating budget. He said he wants to use that money to have one Baby Bullet Train every hour in the off peak.

CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT
Chair Cobey said:
- He would like the CAC members to come up with two or three ideas of priorities for the CAC to address the rest of the year.
- He thinks Caltrain’s annual customer satisfaction survey should include topics that have been discussed at the CAC, such as quiet cars, Wi-Fi, level boarding, and fares based on income.
- He wants a searchable database of CAC minutes to find out what the CAC has done over time.
- He would like to know if there is another tool besides the survey to gain an understanding of customers’ interest on issues that come before the committee.

ELECTRIC MULTIPLE UNIT (EMU) REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL POLICY DISCUSSION RELATED TO EMU PROCUREMENT AND RELATED DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS
Casey Fromson, Government Relations Officer, presented:
- Need to Maximize Capacity
  - Add cars to diesel trains now
  - Caltrain Electrification (2020)
- More trains/serve more riders
  - Increase station stops and/or reduced travel times
    - Level boarding and longer trains
- Key Regional Benefits:
  - Decreases in greenhouse gases, daily traffic congestion, engine noise
  - Improvements in clean air quality and increases in daily ridership, improved frequency and quicker trips
- Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project (PCEP) Service Benefits
  - Today
    - There are five trains that carry 5,100 passengers per hour per direction
    - A Baby Bullet train takes 60 minutes and makes six stops between San Francisco and San Jose
  - After PCEP
    - There will be six trains that carry 6,300 passengers per hour per direction
    - A Baby Bullet train could take 45 minutes to travel from San Francisco to San Jose, or at 60 minutes could make 13 stops

Dave Couch, Project Delivery Director, presented:
- Timeline for 2020 Revenue Service
  - Design Build contractors were prequalified summer 2014
    - The Request for Proposals (RFP) has been issued
    - The Design Build contract will be awarded in fall 2015
  - The EMU RFP will be issued in July
    - The EMU contract will be awarded winter 2015
- Request for Information from car builders – summer 2014
  - To maximize seats would require bi-level vehicles
  - Use currently available makes of cars, which are service-proven and saves costs and time
  - Comply with U.S. regulations
  - Two double doors per car at 22 inches to 25 inches
- Recommended EMU
  - Two double doors located at 25 inches
  - One to two steps up from platform
  - Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) passengers and bikes located at 25-inch level
    - ADA would use mini highs and wayside lifts
    - Similar to today’s Bombardier cars
- Level Boarding is Important for
  - Safety enhancements
  - Operating efficiencies
  - Passenger convenience
  - ADA compliance
- Level Boarding Challenges
  - Lengthy construction period with revenue service
  - California Public Utilities Commission waiver needed for freight corridor
  - Tenants with different boarding heights
Station area impacts (e.g. ramps, circulation)

- Stakeholder Request for EMU Modification
  - California High-speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) vehicles will require high door boarding
  - Caltrain EMUs be modified to support high door boarding
  - Enables common platforms in future
  - Provides system operational flexibility

- Explore Modification Options
  - December 2014 to May 2015
    - Car builder interviews
    - Technical analysis
    - Caltrain operational assessment
    - Policy discussion/decisions
    - Updates to Boards and stakeholders

- Car Builder Interviews
  - Seven car builders participated and proposed
    - Cars with more doors – possible seat loss
    - Cars with traps – possible reliability concerns
  - Could redesign existing vehicles to save money and time

- Analysis
  - Two modification options
  - Two timeframes
    - 2020 electrified service without high-speed rail (HSR)
    - Future blended service with HSR
  - Focus areas
    - Boarding for passengers with and without bikes, ADA
    - Passenger circulation within the cars
    - Operational challenges

- Terminology
  - Caltrain EMU floor above top of rail (ATOR): 22 inches to 25 inches
  - CHSRA floor ATOR: 48 inches to 51 inches
  - Current platforms ATOR: eight inches

- Timeframe: 2020 electrified service
  - Modification A – Cars with more doors
    - Two double doors at 25-inch and 50-inch height for a total of four double doors
    - Passengers and bikes use 25-inch doors with one to two steps
    - ADA location to be determined
  - Modification B – Cars with traps
    - Two single doors with traps, two single doors with no traps, all doors to 50-inch floor. Single door access means longer dwell time
    - Passengers and bikes would use the two single doors with traps and step up three to five steps
    - ADA location at 50-inch level

- Timeframe: future blended system with level boarding
  - Scenario 1
    - Shared platforms at two to three CHSRA/Caltrain stations
• Shared platforms at 50-inch height
• Caltrain stations have level boarding at 25 inches
• Modification A – Cars with more doors
  o Continue using both doors
  o Seats cannot be restored
  o Interior lift needed for ADA
  o Potential mitigation by car reconfiguration
• Modification B – Cars with traps
  o Continue using traps
  o Interior circulation challenges
  o Scenario 2
    ▪ Shared platforms at all 27 stations at 50 inches
      • Modification A – Cars with more doors
        o Seal low doors and use high doors only
        o Interior reconfiguration/restore seats
        o Bike circulation and storage challenge
        o Interior lift needed for ADA
        o Potential mitigation by car reconfiguration
      • Modification B – Cars with traps
        o Seal traps
        o Single door (dwell impacts)
        o Bike circulation and storage challenge

Ms. Fromson presented:
• Potential Path Forward – Framework
  o Blended system partnership
  o Blended system is not yet defined
  o Early investment program
  o Need to make EMU design decision now to not preclude common platforms with CHSRA in the future
• Potential Path Forward – Cars with More Doors Option
  o Challenges
    ▪ Seat loss/passenger circulation inside car
    ▪ Short-term solution
      ▪ Design car with two sets of doors
      ▪ Keep high doors sealed/use low doors
      ▪ Car configured similar to original EMUs
      ▪ Request CHSRA to fund modification costs
  o Future blended system
    ▪ Evaluate use of high doors
    ▪ Associated car interior reconfiguration
• Future Blended Service
  o Additional work needed
  o Community planning/environmental review
  o Blended system definition
• Next Steps
  o June
    ▪ Update JPB on proposed path forward
- Seats/bikes/bathroom balance
  - July Board action
    - Release EMU RFP
    - Updated funding plan/CHSRA additional funding commitment

Mr. Berk said there must be a more effective way to put a bike on the train. He said 50 inches does not seem like the right height for Caltrain. He asked why the focus is not on the stations where a center platform is at 50 inches for HSR and the side platforms are at 25 inches for Caltrain. He said the shared stations should be cleverly designed to accommodate both types of trains. Ms. Fromson said the original staff recommendation was a scenario with separate dedicated platforms that could accommodate both types of trains. That recommendation has evolved based on stakeholder requests for Caltrain to procure a vehicle that could be used at a common platform with CHSRA.

Ben Tripousis, Northern California Regional Director, CHSRA, said a 46- to 51-inch platform is the international standard in order to operate at 220 miles per hour. It allows CHSRA to maximize competition for the procurement, and a service-proven design is needed. There are no operating high-speed trains that have a 30-inch boarding level that meet these criteria. The equipment necessary to operate at high speed is under the floor of the train. The advantages of a common-level boarding solution are: improving operations at common stations, improving passenger circulation, which includes reduced dwell time, improving safety and ADA facilities, improving reliability, allowing the ability to move trains to any platform when there is a disabled train on the line or medical emergency, significantly reducing overall infrastructure costs, improving overall system operations and throughput, maximizing interoperability, and achieving service readiness sooner.

Mr. Berk said none of this negates the solution he proposed. Mr. Tripousis said at most of the stations in the Caltrain corridor, the platform size would result in challenging circulation and the need for high-blocks and other platform furniture. The platform width at many stations is not sufficient to accommodate that type of circulation.

Ms. Levin asked when mockups will be reviewed to help design the most efficient passenger flow. Ms. Fromson said there will be mockups when a car builder is onboard.

Mr. Berk left at 7:15 p.m.

Ms. Levin asked if environmental approval is needed to raise platform heights or if it is California Environmental Quality Act exempt. Ms. Fromson said it depends on how big and what type the change is, the size of the platform, and the station site. Changes could impact the footprint, historic stations, road crossings, pedestrian crossings, or other buildings.

Mr. Scharff asked how these issues are being handled in Southern California. Mr. Tripousis said they are looking to Caltrain on how to handle it. This area is further ahead in the electrification process.
Mr. Scharff asked when Caltrain will get to the Transbay Terminal. Mr. Tripousis said the Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA) is building the terminal. It will be complete by the end of 2017. The TJPA is in midst of formulating a funding plan for the construction of the Downtown Extension Project, but there is no firm schedule.

Mr. Shaw asked how the metrics are going to be determined that come up with a balance for the bikes/bathrooms/seats/standees. He said he hopes this committee has ability to influence the metrics. He said he is concerned that Caltrain might be compromised because of CHSRA. Ms. Fromson said staff is meeting with the public at several venues to get feedback and be transparent.

Ms. Levin said metrics could include capacity, passengers per peak hour per direction, service to Transbay, dwell time, and the customer experience at shared stations.

Public Comment
Doug DeLong, Mountain View, said the high-speed alignment is not going to be along the Caltrain service alignment on the Union Pacific tracks at the Gilroy Caltrain Station, so that is not a common station. The tracks at Diridon are going to be up in the air for CHSRA, so that is not a common platform. The only relevant stations for common platforms are Millbrae and the Transbay Terminal. He said the tracks or platforms could be raised and lowered by hydraulic jacks so both trains could use the same platform face. He said CHSRA is bribing Caltrain with money, but it will result in messing up the service.

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said the Federal Railroad Administration believes the CHSRA equipment height and width must be compatible with North American equipment to be able to share tracks. He said the French have ordered 840 trains for $10 billion that have a two-plus-two configuration. He presented his ideas on a modified EMU, which was provided in the correspondence packet.

Ms. Levin asked if the Diridon Caltrain Station track alignment will be elevated. Mr. Tripousis said that is not set in stone. An analysis completed about four years ago included that option and another option was at-grade. As the environmental review goes through, those options will be reviewed, and he believes having an at-grade solution may be more workable. He said he is working with Union Pacific at Gilroy to operate adjacent to the corridor and he expects to serve the downtown Gilroy station. He said CHSRA has contributed money to Gilroy to assist in the planning process for their area master plan.

Jeff Carter, Millbrae, said CHSRA should not dictate to Caltrain how to set up the platforms. He asked how 50-inch platforms will work with freight and other tenants. The priority of this body is Caltrain and increasing efficiency and capacity of Caltrain. Trains with trap doors are too old school and should be put to rest. Double doors are worthy of study. Caltrain should not be limited to six-car trains. Increasing platforms and the length of trains and more than six trains per hour to get more capacity should be discussed.
PRESENTATION ON THE FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2016 OPERATING AND CAPITAL BUDGET PROCESS

Aandy Ly, Manager, Budgets, presented:

- Operating Budget
  - Farebox revenue will go over $80 million in FY2015
  - The farebox recovery budget for FY2016 is 60 percent
  - A fare increase will be proposed, including the Go Pass, in January 2016
  - Fare increases are anticipated to be made every other year. Staff will be proposing to use one-time funds
  - Total preliminary revenue is $139.1 million, an increase of $8.4 million
  - Total preliminary expenses are $139.1 million, an increase of $11.6 million
  - The budget is balanced
  - Member Contributions
    - San Mateo: $6,080,000
    - Santa Clara: $8,413,758
    - San Francisco: $5,233,692
    - Total: $19,727,450
  - Caltrain’s Structural Deficit
    - Need dedicated permanent funding source
    - Using one-time funding sources to balance the budget
    - Continuing to explore a full range of options
    - Need continued support from partner agencies, businesses, labor, environmental and community-based organizations and elected officials
  - Next Step: Long-term focus on funding options

- Capital Budget Development
  - Call for Projects – January 5
  - Project managers prepare budget requests – February 3
  - Budget and Grants review requests – February 13
  - Peer Review Committee reviews projects – March 6
  - Executive Team reviews proposals – April 24
  - Board sees preliminary budget – May 7
  - Board adopts budget – June 4

- Deliverables
  - Work Plan
  - Project Evaluation Form
  - Project Justification Form

- Review Capital Budget Goals
  - Invest in infrastructure and equipment improvements to maintain system in a state of good repair
  - Invest in the rehabilitation and replacement of components for the rail vehicles to ensure fleet availability
  - Continue system safety improvements
  - Begin delivery of the Caltrain Modernization (CalMod) Program, and continue planning with CHSRA

- FY2016 Capital Budget total: $200.8 million
- Capital Projects Highlights
  - State of good repair - $70.4 million
- Station and intermodal access
- Right of way/signal and communications
- Rolling stock
  - CalMod - $122.5 million
    - Rolling stock replacement
    - Electrification
  - Legal mandates and required enhancements - $1.9 million
    - Railroad bridge load ratings
    - Santa Clara County grade crossing medians
  - Operational improvements/enhancements - $2.9 million
    - Right of way fencing
    - Train departure monitors at terminal stations
  - Planning/studies - $3.1 million

- FY2016 Capital Funding Sources
  - Federal grants - $21.1 million
  - State and regional grants - $1.5 million
  - Other (CalMod Early Investment Program) - $163.2 million
  - JPB member agency contribution - $15 million

- Next Steps
  - Negotiate Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funds on hold with MTC.
  - Present balanced budget in June.

Public Comment
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said fuel is listed at $18.5 million, but the actual number should be $12.6 million. Staff overestimated the amount of fuel Caltrain uses. They estimated the cost per gallon at $3.40, but the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority estimates $2.75 per gallon. When the farebox jumped 100 percent, the Administrative Expenses went up from $10 million to $20 million, so that $10 million is not needed. The Managing Agency Administrative Overhead is $5.8 million. The San Mateo County Transit District contribution to the operating budget is $6.1 million, so that leaves $300,000. He said all this money can be used to run Baby Bullet trains every hour. He said the “Other” funding source of $163 million is the FTA funding for new trains.

Mr. Ly said the $12 million fuel cost Mr. Lebrun is referring to is a year-to-date expense, not the full annual expense. He said staff takes a conservative approach to the fuel budget since oil prices are very volatile. He said about 4.6 million gallons of fuel are budgeted for the year. Even a one-cent increase equates to $46,000, and a 10-cent increase equates to $460,000. If the budgeted money is not spent, then there will be budget savings. He said the “Other” funding is from the Early Investment Program, and staff is not using that money for other purposes; it is strictly for the CalMod Program.

Mr. Scharff asked where the shuttles go and what they do. Ms. Maguigad said some shuttles are pass-through costs, some the JPB pays for. There are 30 different shuttle services that help with Caltrain stations and the last mile.

Ms. Levin asked for ridership figures and costs on Santa Clara County partners.
Mr. Scharff asked what drove administrative cost increase. Mr. Ly said there was an increase of $2.3 million, and the major drive is coming from consultant services needed for operations, engineering and construction.

Mr. Scharff asked why there is an increase in fuel costs. Mr. Ly said the majority of that increase is from the greenhouse gas tax of 13 cents per gallon, and there is a small increase in volume due in part to the new railcars that were added to trains.

Ms. Levin asked why costs to run trains goes up if Positive Train Control adds automation. Ms. Maguigad said it is not automation, it is there as a safety net. The engineers will still be operating the train. Additional costs are due to training and implementation. Mr. Ly said additional employees are needed for the extra train that was added.

Mr. Scharff left at 8:06. Due to a loss of a quorum, the meeting adjourned.

DATE, TIME AND LOCATION OF NEXT MEETING:
June 17, 2015 at 5:40 p.m., San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building, 2nd Floor Bacciocco Auditorium, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA.

Meeting adjourned at 8:06 p.m.
TO: Citizens Advisory Committee

FROM: Josh Averill
Assistant District Secretary

SUBJECT: AMENDMENT TO BYLAWS

ACTION
This report is for information only. No action is required.

BACKGROUND
A subcommittee consisting of Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) members Adina Levin, Yvonne Mills, and Brian Shaw reviewed the By-laws with staff on April 17. Their proposed changes are included in the attached red-lined version for consideration by the entire CAC.

Per Article VI of the By-laws, amendments must be submitted in writing one meeting before the vote for approval. If no other amendments are made at the June meeting, the amendments will be up for approval at the July meeting.

Prepared by: Josh Averill, Assistant District Secretary 650.508.6223
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD

BY-LAWS

ARTICLE I – MEMBERSHIP

Section 1. As prescribed by the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board ("JPB" or "Board"), the Citizens Advisory Committee ("CAC" or "Committee") shall consist of nine (9) members, three appointed from each constituent county (San Francisco County, San Mateo County, Santa Clara County). Each county will select its county committee members and the JPB will affirm these appointments. CAC members should reflect the demographics of Caltrain riders. The Citizens Advisory Committee shall act in an advisory capacity to the JPB. Its activities shall include seeking the views of various groups of users and potential users of Caltrain and ancillary transit facilities, and to develop proposals and recommendations for meeting the needs of these various groups; reviewing and commenting on staff proposals and actions as requested by the JPB; and assisting the JPB in any matter which the Board may deem appropriate.

Section 2. CAC members shall serve three (3) year terms.

ARTICLE II – OFFICERS

Section 1. The Officers of the CAC shall be a Chairperson and a Vice-Chairperson. Their duties shall be as follows:

Chairperson: Presides over CAC meetings; develops the monthly meeting agenda; appoints subcommittees and subcommittee chairpersons; and represents the CAC to external parties and committees.
responsible for submission of the report of the most recent CAC meeting, in a manner the Chair deems suitable, for the monthly JPB meetings, and may delegate this responsibility to another CAC member, or ensures that another representative is present. The Chairperson may call a special meeting of the Committee should the Chairperson deem it appropriate.

Vice-Chairperson: Presides over the CAC meetings in the absence of the Chairperson; conducts the other duties of the Chairperson in his/her absence.

Should neither the Chairperson nor Vice-Chairperson be able to perform the duties of the chair, the remaining members shall elect one of themselves to serve as temporary chair.

Section 2. Selection of Officers shall be made as follows:

Chairperson: The Chairperson shall be elected by a majority of the appointed members at the January meeting.

The term of office shall be for one year. If the term of appointment of the member elected Chairperson expires before the year is out and that member does not either seek reappointment or the Board does not grant such reappointment, the Vice-Chairperson will serve as Chairperson until the following January.

Vice-Chairperson: This Officer shall be elected by a majority of the appointed members at the January meeting. The term of office shall be for one year. If the term of appointment of the member elected Vice-Chairperson expires before the year is out and that member does not either seek reappointment or the Board does not grant such reappointment, the Committee will hold an election for a Vice-Chairperson to serve out the remainder of the term.
Except in extenuating circumstances as determined by the Committee, at no time shall two officers be elected from the same county. The officers shall be elected in a rotation between counties on a yearly basis. If the majority of the Committee chooses, Officers may be retained for a period longer than one year.

Clerk of the Committee: The Clerk shall be appointed by the Executive Director of JPB who will serve as staff to the Committee. The duties of Clerk to the Committee shall be to prepare and post the agenda, as advised by the CAC officers. In addition, the Clerk shall attend all regularly scheduled and special meetings of the CAC and shall prepare monthly minutes for the CAC, staff reports and public hearing notices when appropriate.

Section 3. In the case of vacancy.

In the case of any vacancy in office, the vacancy shall be filled by an election at the first regular meeting after the occurrence of the vacancy.

ARTICLE III – MEETINGS

Section 1. The regular meetings of the CAC shall be held on the third Wednesday of each month at 5:40 p.m. The CAC can approve amending its regularly scheduled meeting time, date and location without having to seek Board authorization. Ten (10) meetings per year will be held at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, California. One (1) meeting will be held in San Francisco County, and one (1) meeting will be held in Santa Clara County. The meeting venues will be determined by the committee prior to the meeting. Any meeting may be cancelled or postponed by
majority vote of those in attendance at any meeting prior to the meeting being cancelled or postponed.

Section 2. The CAC meetings are subject to the Ralph M. Brown Act, Government Code Section 54950, et seq.

Section 3. Attendance being of prime importance to maintain contact between constituents and Committee, attendance of members is required at all meetings. Should a member be unable to attend a meeting they should notify the Clerk to the Committee before the meeting. Should any member have more than two (2) unexcused absences in a calendar year, the Chair shall send the member a reminder of the attendance policy. Any member who is absent for four (4) regularly scheduled meetings during a calendar year shall automatically be terminated. Any resulting vacancy shall be filled for the duration of the departing member’s term.

Section 4. Any Committee member can have an item placed on the agenda by notifying the Clerk to the Committee seventy-two (72) hours prior to the meeting.

ARTICLE IV – SUBCOMMITTEES

Section 1. Subcommittees and Ad Hoc Committees may be established by the Chairperson as necessary.

Section 2. Each subcommittee shall consist of at least three (3) CAC members, one (1) delegate from each county, appointed by the CAC Chairperson.
ARTICLE V – PARLIAMENTARY AUTHORITY

Section 1. The rules contained within the current edition of Robert's Rules of Order (Newly Revised) shall govern the CAC in all cases to which they are applicable and in which they are not inconsistent with these by-laws, and any special rules of order the CAC may adopt.

Section 2. A quorum is defined as a majority of seats currently filled. All official acts of the Committee shall require a quorum of seats currently filled.

ARTICLE VI – AMENDMENT OF BY-LAWS

These by-laws may be amended at any regular meeting of the CAC by a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the CAC members present and voting, provided that the amendment has been submitted in writing at the previous regular meeting.

ARTICLE VII – CONFLICT OF INTEREST

There shall be no personal or monetary gain by members of the CAC as a result of their membership and actions on the CAC. Reimbursement for expenses that may be authorized by the Executive Director from time to time shall not be deemed to be compensation.

ARTICLE VIII – MAJORITY/MINORITY REPORTS

CAC members may elect to present separate reports on decisions and actions by the CAC under the following circumstances: A majority report will reflect at
least two-thirds (2/3) of the CAC members present and voting. A minority report will reflect at least twenty-five percent (25%) of the CAC members present and voting.

ARTICLE IX – ORDER OF BUSINESS

The Order of business for a regular meeting shall be as follows:

a. CALL TO ORDER
b. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG
c. ROLL CALL
d. MINUTES - Approval
e. CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT
f. PUBLIC COMMENTS – At this time persons in the audience may speak on any item on the agenda or any other matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee. The Brown Act (the State local agency open meeting law) prohibits the CAC from acting on any matter that is not on the agenda. It is the policy of Committee to refer such matters to staff for investigation and/or action. Speakers are requested to fill out a "speaker” card located on the table by the door and hand it to staff before the meeting. The Chair may limit speakers to three minutes each.
g. PUBLIC HEARINGS
h. COMMITTEE COMMENTS
i. PENDING ACTION REPORTS
j. STAFF REPORTS
k. OLD BUSINESS
l. NEW BUSINESS
m. OTHER ISSUES

n. ADJOURNMENT
JPB CAC By-laws Subcommittee
Prepared by:

Jerry Graham – JPB CAC SMC
Bruce Balshone – JPB CAC SFC
Mike Rodriguez – JPB CAC SCC

May 2, 2002
JPB Resolution No. 2002-13

Amended July 1, 2010
JPB Resolution No. 2010-33

Amended December 15, 2010
CAC Motion

Amended March 1, 2012
JPB Motion

Amended December 4, 2014
JPB Resolution No. 2014-54
JPB CAC

CORRESPONDENCE
Item # 8
Presentation on Schedule Coordination with the
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

June 17, 2015
From: Averill, Joshua
Sent: Wednesday, April 15, 2015 3:57 PM
To: Robert L. Kirby
Cc: VTA Advisory Committee Coordinator Stephen Flynn; Sunnyvale Councilman David Whittum; Sunnyvale Councilman Glenn Hendricks; Cupertino Mayor Rod Sinks; Cupertino citizen David Brinegar; cacsecretary (@caltrain.com); CAC Chairman Christopher Cobey; CAC Member Cat Tucker; CAC Member Adina Levin; CAC Member Greg Scharff
Subject: RE: VTA and Caltrain connections

Dr. Kirby,

Correspondence, including any personal information such as names and e-mail addresses, submitted to this agency will become disclosable public records. This e-mail, which was addressed to the CAC, among others, is now a public record. This statement is on our website.

There are several reasons why this “VTA and Caltrain Connections” item was not put on the April agenda.

- Staff would like to involve VTA in this discussion and is working with VTA planners to find a date to address the CAC about scheduling. JPB staff have been in touch with VTA and are working together on a presentation.
- Numerous time-sensitive topics are scheduled to be brought before the JPB CAC over the next several months, and only so many items can be presented at any given meeting due to time constraints.
- After discussing this issue with the CAC chair, the chair decided this VTA issue was not a priority for the CAC at this time and that the item would be put on the agenda at a future date. JPB staff and VTA staff are working on finding a month that would work, which may be as early as May.

As you are aware, the CAC is interested in learning more about this topic, how scheduling is done, and how JPB and VTA already work together to meet connections. It will be brought to the CAC. Whether action, such as a motion of support, will be necessary remains to be seen.

With Regards,

Josh Averill
Assistant District Secretary
San Mateo County Transit District
1250 San Carlos Avenue
San Carlos CA 94070-1306
650-508-6223
AverillJ@SamTrans.com

From: Robert L. Kirby [mailto:kirby.bob@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2015 4:01 PM
To: cacsecretary (@caltrain.com); Averill, Joshua; CAC Chairman Christopher Cobey; CAC Member Cat Tucker; CAC Member Adina Levin; CAC Member Greg Scharff
Cc: VTA Advisory Committee Coordinator Stephen Flynn; Sunnyvale Councilman David Whittum; Sunnyvale Councilman Glenn Hendricks; Cupertino Mayor Rod Sinks; Cupertino citizen David Brinegar
Subject: VTA and Caltrain connections

Dear CAC Secretary,

At the March 18th, Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB) Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting, agenda item 8 "Discussion on Requesting VTA Make Schedule Changes to Support Caltrain" was
seeming favorably received and was extended to related topics. Despite the apparent inclination of committee members to act, staff said that the agenda item could not be acted upon because it was a discussion item. The impression was given that actions could be taken during the next CAC meeting on April 15th. However, no action agenda item appears for the April meeting on the extended topics.

Could an agenda item be added to the next meeting? Assuming such an addition requires a request from a committee member, could committee members be informed please? Would the CAC Secretary please place this request, without the E-mail addresses, and earlier related messages in the CAC reading materials please?

In order to aid the committee, a draft resolution of the CAC that requests that the PCJPB make a request to the VTA follows this message.

Bob Kirby

Robert L. Kirby, Ph.D.
kirby.bob@gmail.com
1-408-736-6757 (home in Sunnyvale)

---------

The Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) requests that its Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB) make the following request to the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), both electronically and with mail:

The Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB) requests that the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) declare a high priority on interconnections between VTA vehicles and Caltrain trains to improve passenger experiences on both systems. Good interconnections should increase ridership on both systems. The PCJPB has several priority items.

- VTA vehicles should meet trains, with the highest priority given the passengers transferring from trains coming from the north. A goal can be to have a transfer wait of 10 minutes or less. Except for particularly late trains, VTA vehicle operators would wait for transferring passengers.

- VTA vehicles should meet all trains from the north, particularly the last few trains. In the late evening, alternate bus routes with longer headways might serve. Such service can advertise a safe ride home, even when its late.

- VTA routes should be configured to allow most potential passengers that would transfer between VTA and Caltrain services to travel only a short distance during transfers and travel a limited distance from residences or businesses to reach a route with a single VTA trip. A goal for transfers can be less than 2 blocks (200 meters). A goal for reaching VTA routes can be less than 5/8 mile (1 kilometer) for lower density suburban housing and shorter distances for businesses and higher density housing.

- VTA advertisements should include improved VTA interoperability with Caltrain.

- VTA staff should be encouraged to find additional ways to improve interoperability between the VTA and Caltrain systems.

Please inform the PCJPB or its staff about how it may assist with coordinating a unified transportation system.
This message is a public comment that the web page http://www.vta.org/News-and-Media/Connect-with-VTA/VTA-Proposing-Two-Year-Plan-with-Overall-Increase-in-Service solicited about the VTA FY 2016 and FY 2017 Transit Service Plan. This message is also information for the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB) Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) reading files, which follows up on a PCJPB CAC March 18, 2015 discussion item (#8), which could be considered for action at their next meeting. http://www.caltrain.com/about/advisorycommittees/cac.html leads to the PCJPB CAC agendas and minutes.

The VTA plan does not mention coordination with Caltrain. If VTA busses met the trains, more potential riders would transfer between the systems, particularly if the VTA made interoperability a high priority goal and advertised its intent.

Currently some busses, such as line 55, which stops near the Sunnyvale Caltrain station, have schedules that maximize potential passenger wait times. Line 55 leaves a minute after Caltrain arrives, not allowing bus passengers enough time to reach the train except when the train is late nor allowing train passengers enough time to reach the bus even when the train is on time. Such scheduling works against the VTA Strategic Plan http://www.vta.org/about-us/vta-strategic-plan first goal: "Increase Ridership". Surveys of Caltrain customers http://www.caltrain.com/about/statsandreports/Surveys.html show that few take a VTA bus to or from Caltrain. Santa Clara County businesses have been pressured into using private transportation services for their employees to fill the VTA service void.

Layovers of busses at Caltrain stations were suggested in order to drop off and later pick up transferring passengers, minimizing their wait times. Rita P. Haskin, Executive Officer, Customer Service and Marketing for SamTrans and Caltrain responded:
"We've shared your message with staff from the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority. The Caltrain and VTA staffs have a good working relationship and coordinate on schedule changes. Our mutual goal is to make transfers work as well as possible. It's also important to remember that some bus routes have multiple key destinations, not just Caltrain."
"When serving a train station, or transit center with other buses, it's a balancing act between whether the bus should arrive in time to deliver customers to the station or in time to receive customers from the arriving train. It's generally not feasible to do both because customers traveling on the bus whose destination is past the train station will be inconvenienced."

Layovers, which were done decades ago, are inconvenient but not necessarily intolerable for through passengers. However, there are alternatives.

Addressing half of the transfer issues, bus schedule changes could keep transfer waits to less than 10 minutes including walking times from Caltrain, particularly northbound trains in the morning through midday and southbound trains in the evening. There are no obvious scheduling needs to prevent such changes.
Bus drivers could be instructed to wait for Caltrain arrivals as long the train was not excessively delayed, perhaps no more than 5 minutes, and for passengers to purposefully walk from the nearer end of the train. Electronic signage, such as that used on Caltrain platforms, or smart phone apps could keep drivers and passengers informed. Electronic signage on busses or moveable placards displayed at the front of busses could explain the wait to through passengers. Caltrain conductors could call ahead about the extra time needs of rare, mobility restricted passengers using a highly interoperable system.

The above first alternative could be extended to splitting some northwest county bus lines into two overlapping lines. Each line could have busses timed to arrive about 10 minutes before selected train arrivals. Each line could then continue through the higher density service areas near the Caltrain station for about 20 minutes and then return to meet arriving Caltrain passengers.

An more radical alternative could be reducing services levels on El Camino Real (ECR) in order to transfer resources to reduce headways of bus line service to Caltrain stations. Such a change would recognize the importance of Caltrain, a more efficient and more environmentally friendly intermodal system for longer distance service over disrupting local traffic with dedicated ECR lanes in areas with lower density housing, which must rely on private vehicles for local travel.

Perhaps real improvements will only come with the VTA Strategic Plan having its second goal be to interoperate with Caltrain to create a unified transportation system. But that might require VTA Policy Advisory Committee or VTA Board of Directors actions.

Bob Kirby

Robert L. Kirby, Ph.D.  
kirby.bob@gmail.com  
1-408-736-6757 (home in Sunnyvale)  
http://www.linkedin.com/in/bobkirby
In [http://www.vta.org/News-and-Media/Connect-with-VTA/VTA-Proposing-TwoYear-Plan-with-Overall-Increase-in-Service](http://www.vta.org/News-and-Media/Connect-with-VTA/VTA-Proposing-TwoYear-Plan-with-Overall-Increase-in-Service), the VTA FY 2016 and FY 2017 Transit Service Plan proposes starting October 2015 that headways on the VTA free Airport shuttle bus line 10 be lengthened from 15 minutes to 30 minutes in order to fund a new, regular fare bus line 11 covering San Jose Airport, downtown San Jose Light Rail Transit (LRT) route, and Diridon Caltrain Station. Downtown Area Shuttle (DASH), which is free bus line 201, also partly serves the proposed line 11 San Jose service areas. Bus line 11 line would also operate with 30 minute headways.

The current 15 minute headways of line 10 are barely short enough. To airline passengers accustomed to less than 5 minute headway people movers at many airports, a potential 15 minute delay waiting for a shuttle indicates the services of an inferior airport. Doubling the headway on both lines 10 and 11 could significantly reinforce such opinions. The reputation of San Jose could be hurt. Most airport passengers would rather hire drivers or retrieve their cars before considering such waits, particularly at the end of potentially trying air travel experiences.

The proposed line 11 does little to improve airport transportation. The existing line 10 already connects to LRT at the Metro Airport Station, which, in turn, gives service to the areas to be covered by line 11. A speed advantage of briefly using Highway 87 over LRT to the San Jose downtown LRT stops does not really extend to the Diridon Caltrain Station. The existing line 10 service to the Santa Clara Transit Center connects to Diridon (and SAP Arena) via regular bus line 22 and 522 service and via less frequent but quicker Caltrain service. The service on line 11, as with LRT, is inhibited by the slow speeds between the 1st Street LRT downtown stations.

Lengthening headways on line 10 also hurts intermodal service with Caltrain, which instead should be encouraged as the most efficient and environmentally friendly service available. When the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB) Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) mentioned the proposed change during their March 18th meeting, the comments were that no (or, without hyperbole, very few) Caltrain riders would use the service with lengthened headways. The committee seemed to agree on this assessment but no vote was taken since the comment was made during a discussion-only agenda item. The PCJPB CAC may be contacted through the Committee Secretary at cacsecretary@caltrain.com or by phone at 650-508-6223. The PCJPB CAC could be formally asked for their opinion.

Abandoning the proposal to create bus line 11 in order to not lengthen bus line 10 headways seems appropriate.

Bob Kirby

Robert L. Kirby, Ph.D.
kirby.bob@gmail.com
Thank you for responding to my message to the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB) Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC), which has been forwarded to the PCJPB. My message was not so much about the customers that Caltrain and VTA have but about changes, which involve tradeoffs, that could attract new customers with a better integrated, overall transportation system.

Since Caltrain is not directly responsible for VTA busses, suggesting that Caltrain ask VTA for improvements that would improve Caltrain service to the entire population is appropriate. If the PCJPB or its CAC does not specify improvements to VTA that would help Caltrain, how can the PCJPB CAC hope to meet its charter to improve service to groups that are not currently well served or served at all? It should be the role of the VTA, rather than Caltrain, to decide which services the VTA can provide.

Perhaps twenty years ago, I rode a VTA north-south bus route in Sunnyvale that took its layover near the downtown train station. Although I was inconvenienced by the delay, I understood that it was part of the schedule while I waited aboard the bus and then proceeded according to the schedule. I suggested such layovers be reconsidered to further what should be a priority, attracting riders to an integrated system. Alternatively, bus headways could be shortened but I assume that would unacceptably increase expenses.

Currently, I see few signs of Caltrain and VTA cooperation that help the general public. For instance, VTA route 55, which along with routes 32, 53, 54, and 304 serves the Sunnyvale Caltrain station, has rigid 30 minute headways with no advertised provisions to meet trains. Caltrain with bus 55 riders can expect 25 minute transfer delays. Most potential customers will opt for some other form of transportation to avoid waiting so long. If southbound Caltrain 192 arrives after its scheduled 9:55PM arrival, passengers won't even have a minute to run to the last bus 55 at 9:56PM. A good interconnection could guarantee a ride for at least some of the later Caltrain arrivals. The east side of Sunnyvale, through which VTA bus 26 travels, has no usable service to the Sunnyvale or Lawrence Caltrain stations.

Moreover, current improvement efforts are not helping. The VTA North-South study interim results presented to the Sunnyvale City Council on February 10, 2015 included no north-south changes that would improve Caltrain connections. I do not see many good results for interoperability from any collaboration of Caltrain and VTA. With such efforts, using Caltrain with VTA busses will remain an odious choice for most people.

Again, thank you for the response. I have included other addressees to my reply who might change VTA and Caltrain priorities and actions.

Bob Kirby

Robert L. Kirby, Ph.D. kirby.bob@gmail.com
Good afternoon, Mr. Kirby. Your message to members of the Caltrain Board of Directors and Citizens Advisory Committee regarding connections between VTA and Caltrain was referred to me for response.

We’ve shared your message with staff from the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority. The Caltrain and VTA staffs have a good working relationship and coordinate on schedule changes. Our mutual goal is to make transfers work as well as possible. It’s also important to remember that some bus routes have multiple key destinations, not just Caltrain.

When serving a train station, or transit center with other buses, it’s a balancing act between whether the bus should arrive in time to deliver customers to the station or in time to receive customers from the arriving train. It’s generally not feasible to do both because customers traveling on the bus whose destination is past the train station will be inconvenienced.

Caltrain and VTA will continue to collaborate on providing good transportations services to our customers.

Sincerely,

Rita

Rita P. Haskin
SamTrans | Caltrain | TA
Executive Officer, Customer Service and Marketing
1250 San Carlos Ave.
San Carlos, CA 94070-1306
650-508-6248
www.smctd.com

Consumer Report #020273
Thank you for passing the suggestion to the committee staff. Since I have time conflicts with the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting, I ask that the ASCII text enclosure be included as a public comment to the CAC meeting and with the reading files. The enclosure contents are also given below the original message.

Robert L. Kirby, Ph.D.
kirby.bob@gmail.com
1-408-736-6757 (home in Sunnyvale)
http://www.linkedin.com/in/bobkirby

On Thu, Jan 22, 2015 at 8:21 AM, Averill, Joshua <AverillJ@samtrans.com> wrote:
Subject: Agenda Request - Bus to Caltrain

Dr. Kirby,

I passed your request to staff to add an item to the JPBCAC agenda to discuss a VTA hub-and-spoke program to Caltrain from the bus rapid transit line on El Camino Real in Santa Clara County. I was informed that we thank you for this information, but because this is a VTA project, we will not put it on a future agenda. We will let the planning department know about this, and they will work through this as needed on the staff level.

With Regards,

Josh Averill
Assistant District Secretary
San Mateo County Transit District
1250 San Carlos Avenue
Although VTA may be the primary actor on Bus Caltrain interconnection, nonetheless, the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) should and can take actions.

From the CAC By-Laws Article I Membership:
"Its activities shall include seeking the views of various groups of users and potential users of Caltrain and ancillary transit facilities, and to develop proposals and recommendations for meeting the needs of these various groups."

The potential interconnecting bus and train passengers are a mostly unserved group. Most of few 13% of current Caltrain passengers who also bus are probably to the north where interconnections are better.

VTA seemingly views Caltrain stations as higher-traffic bus stops rather than as opportunities for a coordinated transportation system. Instead of coordinating with Caltrain, VTA proposes dedicated bus lanes in its El Camino Real Bus Rapid Transit (ECR BRT) http://www.vta.org/projects-and-programs/brt-el-camino-real-brt-project project, which would unnecessarily disrupt automobile traffic. Such attempts to speed bus traffic to 40 minute travel between the SAP arena at Diridon Station and the Palo Alto transit center ignore the faster times of 30 minutes for current local trains, before Electric Multiple Unit (EMU) speedups, and 20 minute express Caltrain.

Caltrain is the natural owner of efficient longer distance public transportation while VTA naturally provides local, within city or between neighboring sides of cities, services. Caltrain coordinated with VTA busses would provide the most efficient, environmentally friendly, south bay area transportation without provoking longer automobile trip times.

The CAC could take several, mostly low cost actions.

1. The CAC could encourage coordination with the VTA on behalf of potential interconnecting bus and train passengers with a declaration. Although CAC would usually make such declarations only to the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB), they can communicate with VTA or suggest that the PCJPB communicate with VTA. Such a declaration might be;

   The CAC of the PCJPB encourages the VTA to improve coordination with Caltrain.

2. With the current environment of long (30 minute) headways of bus service to Caltrain stations, the CAC of the PCJPB or the PCJPB itself could explicitly request that VTA buses meet trains to reduce passenger wait times. VTA bus meetings could be improved by having layovers occur near Caltrain stations rather than at the ends of each bus line. Then busses could be scheduled to arrive just, with slack, before Caltrain arrivals and then leave after passengers walk to each bus from Caltrain when the train is not excessively (over 5 minutes) late.
3. VTA could be requested to serve several large areas of cities without needing bus transfers. For instance, VTA bus 26, which serves east side of Sunnyvale at its closest comes only within several blocks of the Sunnyvale Caltrain station. There is no bus service for the west of the city of Santa Clara to the obvious Lawrence Caltrain station. The San Antonio station is over a 1/2 mile from the nearest bus transfer centers that could serve western Mountain View, Los Altos, and eastern Palo Alto. Each instance could be improved with rerouted bus lines or additional bus services. Caltrain hub and VTA spoke services could be a rubric for an intent to provide better services.

4. Caltrain staff responsible of scheduling and the communication of schedules could have coordination or at least communication of schedules to VTA be a criteria in personnel performance reviews.

5. Caltrain could provide more fare incentives, particularly to Clipper Card holders even without Caltrain monthly passes, to transfer on or off VTA buses.

6. Caltrain electronic signage could be extended to the VTA bus stops of Caltrain stations. If long VTA headways remain in effect, VTA drivers could see expected Caltrain delays and operated according to protocols that could, for instance, delay bus departures, to transfer passengers from Caltrain service delayed less than 5 minutes. The new, quite successful, Caltrain electronic signage would also reassure passengers.

7. Caltrain could advertise its coordination with VTA buses. Inexpensive advertising could appear on board trains, in platform display cases, in Caltrain newsletters, and on its website.

I hope that you and Caltrain staff will revisit the earlier decision and consider VTA Caltrain interconnections on the agenda of the next CAC meeting.

Robert L. Kirby, Ph.D.
kirby.bob@gmail.com
1-408-736-6757 (home in Sunnyvale)
http://www.linkedin.com/in/bobkirby

CC: Josh Averill CAC Secretary,
Adam Burger VTA Transportation Planner,
CAC Board Member Yvonne Mills,
CAC Board Member Greg Scharff,
County Supervisor Joe Simitian,
County Supervisor Ken Yeager,
VTA Board of Directors,
Sunnyvale councilman David Whittum,
council@sunnyvale.ca.gov,
Sunnyvale citizen Steve Scandalis
JPB CAC

CORRESPONDENCE

Item # 9
CalMod Update – EMU Procurement – Seats/Standees
Bathrooms/Bikes Balance

June 17, 2015
I support more bike space on board and more bike parking at Caltrain (4th & King), right in my neighborhood.

I am writing this note of support while sitting here in downtown San Francisco next to the site of the new Transbay Terminal. Let's get ready for the future, not just with a new building but with the right train design to allow bikes, children and folks with disabilities to all get a chance to experience what it means to ride the rails!

Let's do this done.

Michael Lehane
88 King Street, Unit 619
San Francisco
CA 94107
The existence of train and bike infrastructure has completely changed the manner of moving in the San Francisco Bay area for me and many people I know. It has made the car unnecessary for most of daily routines saving resources for both users ourselves and the city. I am a recurrent user of Caltrain and support the increase on bike infrastructure on the system.

Miguel Lopez Saenz
Hi,

I ride my bike to and from Caltrain in San Francisco on my commute down to Millbrae. It is so convenient to bring my bike along. It allows me to leave work whenever I like and not have to worry about the shuttle. If you want to continue to encourage ridership from commuters, you are going to have to accommodate a much larger number of bikes in the future. Biking is becoming very popular and only going to get more popular as more bikeways are built in SF and the Bay Area. Caltrain needs to be prepared for a cultural shift that is occurring in our society today. People are ditching their cars and using alternative forms of transport. That means more people riding Caltrain and more of those people that want to use their bike as opposed to their car to get around. The more bike space and bike parking available to these riders, the better.

I think you guys do an awesome job and bike space is one of the areas where major improvements can be made. Thank you for hearing my voice as regular Caltrain commuter!

Jake
Dear Caltrain,

I sincerely appreciate the level of service you provide. The quality and frequency of your trains is consistently far better than any other transit agency’s trains or busses. The fact that you provide service for bicycle riders is crucial for many of us who live on the Peninsula and in the South Bay. Our bikes are an essential part of our commute from where we live to your trains and again from your trains to work. Transferring to busses, street cars, and to walking does not always work to get us from your stations to work or home, which is why it is important that you provide both parking spaces at your stations and space on your trains.

Thank you again, for the service you provide. I hope and look forward to it improving as I continue to ride.

Matthew Gaul
Caltrain has done such an awesome job of integrating bikes with Caltrain, that I frequently pray that through some freak miracle, BART and Caltrain will merge and BART management will be fired and Caltrain management will take over. That's how strongly I feel about the way these two organizations recognize cyclists.

Thank you for continuing to find ways to accommodate the increasing numbers of cyclists who are flocking to Caltrain where and when possible in recognition of your success. This includes secure bicycle parking at stations and smoother load/unload flows, along with increased frequency of trains and duration of train service per diem so that both cyclists and pedestrians can get to where they need to go more quickly and without the risk of 'getting bumped' (if you are a cyclist). Hope to see you in Oakland one day!

Segue Fischlin
Hi,

Yes, more bike space!
For a happier and healthier commute!
Reduces the cost of roads, helps people stay in shape; a practical way to commute. No more worries about connector buses. Faster and more efficient. Helps clear the air and reduce CO2 emissions. Less pollution: healthier population!

Sincerely,

Anne Zimmerman

Sent from my iPhone
Dear sir:

I take advantage of the Caltrain resource for commuting to/from work with my bicycle. It is essential I am able to bring my bike on the train for the commute, and I would not be able to use the Caltrain service were I not able to take my bike.

Use of Caltrain produces the following benefits:
1. my car is not on the road, thus relieving traffic congestion in a small part
2. my car’s emissions are not in the air, contributing in small part to offsetting fossil fuel impacts to the environment and planet
3. I am incorporating physical activity into my day, adding to my health, and in its way reducing potential burden to society in my future medical issues and costs
4. my car is not parked at work

On June 8, I noted an alarming increase in the number of bikes on the Caltrain line between Redwood City and SF. I have to say that the overcrowding of the entire train, including congestion of passengers on the cars by the doors and standing in the corridors of the bicycle cargo area, creates a high level of stress for me in getting on and off the train in the short amount of time afforded.

And this has motivated me to write in to urge Caltrain to take steps to improve and increase its support of the bicycling commuting community. The points raised by the SF Bicycle Coalition seem right on target:

- Set a transit agency goal that a minimum of 20% of passengers will access Caltrain by bike by 2020;
- Provide bike capacity for at least 16% of Caltrain passengers, or approximately a 6:1 seat-to-bike space ratio;
- Allocate and invest significant resources, including funding, staff time and station space, to develop robust bike parking facilities and plan for the integration of the upcoming bike share expansion;
- Ensure the most accessible platform and car design as possible for all passengers, including seniors, children, people with disabilities and people bringing bicycles onboard.

Please take this message in all seriousness and take steps to invest in the future of the region by increasing access to bicycles to the Caltrain resources.

Thank you,
Marc
I've taken my bike on CalTrain many times and it's a much better experience than BART. Please retain and enhance this important service.

———

Mark Bult
Interactive product designer and art director
about.me/markbult
I ride Caltrain regularly and I would ride much more if I knew I could get space with my bike.

Also, electric bikes are starting to take off. They are already huge in Europe - 30% of all bikes sold in Germany are electric. As they gain in popularity more and more people will ride bikes and want to take them on Caltrain and park them at the stations. Please expand the access!

Thanks,
Matt
I bike everyday to the 4th & King station after dropping off my daughter at school and take the train back in Palo Alto in the evening to get off at 22nd. Without the ability to take my bike on Caltrain, it would be impossible to combine school drop-off with my commute.

Thank you for considering to add more bike capacity on future cars.

Max
As someone who’s ridden Caltrain a lot, but also experienced other transit systems around the world, I think Caltrain has one of the most efficient and easy-to-use systems for bringing bikes on board. The way we stack bikes takes up the least space, and the way we sort them and stage them by the door makes it loading and unloading quick and painless. I wish other cities adopted the same system!

Bike + Caltrain is one of the best options for getting around along the Caltrain corridor. As a commute method, it’s efficient, healthy, and the most environment-friendly way to get around. And becoming increasingly popular.

Please support increased bike capacity to fulfill the projected increase in bicycle riders on Caltrain. If the rule is either my bike comes or I get to sit, I’d rather bring my bike, because that’s how I get around once I’m off the train. I know seating is important, but bicycle capacity increases the range of people who can easily access the Caltrain stations, so please keep that in mind, too!

Thanks~

~Elika
I'm a bike + Caltrain commuter. My sanity relies on being able to commute this way and avoid the headaches of automobile traffic. I want to thank Caltrain for being forward thinking by starting and then expanding the bike+train program over the years. At this critical time in planning for the future, I urge Caltrain to take into account a rising demand for bicycle space on Caltrain and plan appropriately!

Best Regards,

David Steele
22nd St. to Sunnyvale commuter
I Support More Bike Space On Board and More Bike Parking for Caltrain
Gentlemen,
Adequate bike storage on the trains is essential to providing the final mile (or five) of connections for commuters and recreational travelers.

Jerry Cahill
Calfox, Inc.
300 Drake’s Landing Road, Suite 207
Greenbrae CA 94904
tel (415) 464-3664
draft (415) 464-3678
Dear Caltrain,

I have heard that you will soon be making a major decision that might affect the number of spaces available for bikes and bikers, and I am writing this message to encourage you to maximize capacity for cyclist to the extent possible.

As a commuter between San Francisco and Stanford campus, and a non-car owner, Caltrain is a lifesaver for me. I’ve figured out how to work the system and make sure I get a space on the train leaving SF in the mornings, by going early, and boarding early. That strategy has been very successful for me; however, I see so many cyclists who get bumped, especially at the 22nd Street station, and that tells me how many people need their bikes at the other end of their trip.

I realize you have a lot to balance: riders who are not cyclists, are elderly, people with baby strollers, handicapped, etc...., so I do not envy you your job. All of us want access to your great service!

Thank you for your time in reading this and I look forward to continued, positive changes, especially for cyclists, on Caltrain.

Thank you,

Bob Bathrick
Hello!

As one of the many bikers (and non-car-owners) in the bay area, I'm so happy to have the CalTrain option to get around the area. I've spent many years bike commuting, almost always with a CalTrain leg somewhere in the commute, and often with several miles of biking at either end of that ride. Because of the distance, I've always brought my bike on board, and I really appreciate how accommodating, supportive, and kind the caltrain staff is when I do so.

There are times when bike space on the train is insufficient- I've spent many evenings waiting for multiple trains to go by before being able to board one, or standing jammed into an overcrowded bike car; I also see bicyclists get stranded at stations almost daily. I know that caltrain staff tries their best to provide service for as many as possible while maintaining safe conditions; it would be great if we could maintain that safety but still allow more bikers on board with higher bike capacity in the future. It would be a great way to encourage green, healthy commuting habits, and make the train more pleasant for commuters and employees alike!

I'm so excited to hear that higher bike capacity is part of the discussion as caltrain moves forward- I can't wait to see how this awesome service evolves!

Your loyal customer,
Wren
Good Afternoon,

I am writing to urge you to support the Caltrain system that allows commuters to link their home and workplaces via a combination of bike and train. For many people this is the most efficient and ecologically friendly way to accomplish their commute, especially given the poor public transit beyond the Caltrain/El Camino corridor. In order for many riders to take the train they need to be able to take their bikes on board. Once you realize this, you also must realize that more space and resources must be devoted to getting bikes on trains as Caltrain grows. To accomplish those goals I support the SF Bicycle Coalition's proposals, as follows:

- Set a transit agency goal that a minimum of 20% of passengers will access Caltrain by bike by 2020;
- Provide bike capacity for at least 16% of Caltrain passengers, or approximately a 6:1 seat-to-bike space ratio;
- Ensure the most accessible platform and car design as possible for all passengers, including seniors, children, people with disabilities and people bringing bicycles onboard.

As you plan for Caltrain's future, continue to plan for a future with bikes on board.

Sincerely,

Felice Kelly
Dear Caltrain Board,

My wife and I do not own a car and ride Caltrain all the time to the Peninsula and back from San Francisco with our bicycles. Without adequate space on the train for our bikes, we would not be able to ride Caltrain because getting to Caltrain from our home and to our final destination would be impractical. Please continue to accommodate bikes on all trains and to expand the bike space on trains to meet future demand. Thank you.

Regards,

Mark Morey
San Francisco, CA
Hi I live in San Francisco and work at Menlo School in Menlo Park. I want to commute more often by bicycle and Caltrain to and from my job. I am sometimes unable to find room in the bicycle train cars for me or my bike so I instead choose to drive. It would be great if there was more seating and room for bikes on your trains. Thank you

Donoson FitzGerald
Gary Wu <trade333sell@yahoo.com>

Tuesday, June 09, 2015 12:40 PM

I Support More Bike Space On Board and More Bike Parking for Caltrain
Over the past 4 years my Caltrain ridership has increased by 10x. Once I began taking my bike on Caltrain, I could cover the 1.6 miles from my home to the Mountain View station which frequently has a full parking lot. I ride to San Jose for volunteer work 1.8 miles from the train station then up my office in Palo Alto 2.3 mile from the Caltrain Station. I also frequently travel to San Mateo and San Francisco for social events now. For riders like me that live and work beyond walking distance, the ability to take a bike on Caltrain is essential flexibility. I no longer sit in auto traffic on 101, but am totally dependent on taking my bike on the train. Getting bumped from boarding at Mountain View and Palo Alto has been an increasing problem. Please add capacity can take more trips on Caltrain.

Terry Barton
Home -Mountain View, CA
Volunteer – San Jose, CA
Employer – Menlo Park, CA
I ride my bike to 4th and King everyday and am so thankful for the free bike valet provided there. In my opinion, the bike cars on the trains are always overflowing, don’t provide a good way to stack/sort bicycles and frequently cause damage to bikes due to leaning and banging them against each other.

Please extend the bike valet at 4th and King and at other locations. It is a vital part of the Caltrain experience and a critical link to make the Caltrain work for more people’s commutes.

Thanks,
Jake
Hi There,

Bikes and Caltrain (and the electric future version) could make the Bay Area a worldwide leader in alternate and sustainable transportation solutions. It's a marriage of transportation solutions that is irreplaceable and combines the best of both worlds. Please expand the space for bicycles and improve the frequency and number of express trains for that matter.

Kindly,

Stefan

Sent from my iPhone
Dear Caltrain:

I support the Bicycle Coalition and its recommendations for bicycle access on Caltrain.

Many commuters must use bicycles on both ends of their journeys.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Steven Rosen
San Francisco
Dear Caltrain Board, I am a San Francisco resident and frequently use Caltrain for work and recreation.

I never take the train without bringing my bicycle on board. At both ends of my journey, the bicycle gives me great flexibility and cuts down on my travel time: it is a perfect complement to the train. I very much appreciate the ability to bring bikes on board.

I am especially disappointed, therefore, that your staff recommends having the same bike capacity for electric trains in 2020 as is available on today's trains. Bike boardings are growing substantially faster than walk-on boardings (147% vs 35%, 2008-2014) and already appear to be constrained by available capacity.

As the Bay Area's population grows, and as more people discover the mobility and health benefits of combining train and bicycle travel, bike boardings are sure to continue to grow. While I understand the need to balance the needs of all users, not just cyclists, I encourage you to consider the many practical benefits of increased bike boardings, including reduced need for parking spaces at train stations, decreased load on feeder buses and shuttles, and less pollution and road congestion.

As a result, I urge you to consider increasing bicycle capacity to approximately 20% of total train capacity by 2020.

Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely,

Massimiliano Poletto
San Francisco, CA
I ride my bike to the San Francisco 4th and King station and take Caltrain 206 to Redwood City then ride my bike to the Midpoint Technology Center—about 2 miles each way. I usually take train 261 in the evening.

I take my bike because it can take up to an hour to get from my apartment to Caltrain on the San Francisco Muni—I can make the trip in 10 minutes on my bike. At the Redwood City end there is a shuttle that runs at peak times, but if the train is late, or the shuttle breaks down, or I need to come and go off peak, then its a 2-mile walk. My bike reliably gets me to and from the train (again in about 10 minutes).

I am always able to get on the train in the morning at 4th and King, but the train is often at full bike capacity by San Mateo. Northbound in the afternoon (once the second bike car was added a couple of years ago, thank you VERY much), I've been denied boarding in the evening only once or twice, but the bike car is always packed.

CalTrain has been a leader in allowing bikes on trains and it is disappointing that it is not planning to increase bike capacity on the electrified trains. If ridership growth continues as projected, bicyclists will be underserved in 2020 when electrified service is projected to begin. I understand that Caltrain needs to balance the needs of all passengers, but allowing more bikes on board has more benefit than just the convenience of the cyclist—it reduces automobile traffic in the station areas, frees up seats on feeder buses and shuttles, and reduces pollution. I urge you to increase bike capacity to at least 16%. 20% would be even better.

I'm sure that you have taken the following things under consideration in ridership projections, but they bear mentioning:

All the apartments and condos under construction along the CalTrain corridor.

The Stanford Redwood City campus at the Midpoint Technology Center is in the final planning stages and will begin construction in 2016, with completion of at least the first phase projected for late 2019. I expect that will result in an increase of demand for bike capacity at the Redwood City station.

Trustees give nod of approval to administrative campus in Redwood City
I also expect that the Highway 101/Woodside Road interchange reconstruction, starting in 2019 and continuing through 2021, will result in an increase in ridership of both cyclists and non-cyclists.

Thanks for your consideration. And thanks for allowing bikes on CalTrain.

Bruce Lundquist
San Francisco
Hello,

Please see the attached for a letter from Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition regarding the upcoming decisions for the Caltrain Modernization Project and electrification.

Thank you,
Emma

--

Emma Shlaes
Policy Manager
Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition
96 N. Third Street, Suite 375
PO Box 1927
San Jose, CA 95109
Office: 408-287-7259 Ext. 228
Cell: 650-703-1191
http://bikesiliconvalley.org
June 3, 2015

Caltrain Joint Powers Board of Directors
Caltrain Bicycle Advisory Committee
Caltrain Citizen's Advisory Committee

Re: Caltrain Modernization Project

To Caltrain Joint Power Board of Directors:

I am writing to you as the Executive Director of the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition (SVBC), a membership-based non-profit of over 2,600 members with the mission to create a healthy community, environment, and economy through bicycling for people who live, work, or play in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties. We would like to provide input on the Caltrain Modernization Project and the upcoming July 2 decision regarding configuration of electric multiple units (EMUs).

SVBC recommends the following:

1. Caltrain sets mode share goals for access to stations, recognizing that bikes on board and biking to stations is a cost-effective, environmentally friendly, and healthy transportation option for passengers. Provide for at least 20% of passengers to access the stations by bike by 2020. Set clear, specific strategies of how this goal will be met through bike space onboard, secure bike parking at stations and bike share that is based on data.

2. Provide bike capacity for at least 16% of Caltrain passengers, or approximately a 6:1 seat-to-bike space ratio.

3. Commit to a robust financial commitment for secure and attractive wayside bike parking facilities at Caltrain stations in order to shift some bikes from on-board to wayside. Dedicated resources should also include staff time and station space.

4. Support bike share systems to coordinate with access to Caltrain stations.

5. Ensure the most accessible platform and car design as possible for all passengers, including seniors, children, people with disabilities and people bringing bicycle onboard.

We have enjoyed working with Caltrain over the years and thank you for accommodating bicycles on board the trains as well as providing bicycle parking at Caltrain stations. Caltrain constitutes part of the transportation network for many people who bike along the Peninsula, as the system stretches throughout most of San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties and allows for bicyclists to travel over long distances. Caltrain is an international leader in on-board bike capacity. This has enabled many people to leave their car at home and choose a healthy transportation option. Recently, we have been thrilled with the decision by the JPB to add a third bike car to Bombardier train sets.
With the help of on-board bicycle capacity increases, the number of passengers bringing their bike on board has grown almost four times in the past decade. Available on-board bike spaces are again frequently being filled, resulting in many customers being bumped and forced to wait for a later train or use an alternative means of transportation. We understand the difficult decisions the JPB has to make to satisfy the various competing interests for space on Caltrain and the additional complexity of working with the future High Speed Rail system. We urge you to continue the leadership in bicycle access by setting these strong recommended targets and implementation plans for mode share access to stations and on-board capacity.

In order to reduce the reliance on on-board bike capacity, it is necessary for Caltrain to invest resources into understanding how people could shift to wayside bike parking facilities. Regular bike racks are not always secure enough for everyone to use for long periods of time or overnight. While this won't be a solution for everyone, there are so many options and we look forward to working with Caltrain on the Bicycle Parking Management Plan to help find the right mix of wayside facilities that can shift bikes from on-board. Dedicated funding to ensure that the findings of that plan are implemented is essential.

A huge thank you to the Caltrain JPB for so carefully considering the issues that affect so many of your passengers and future passengers. In addition, Caltrain staff, including Mark Simon, Casey Fromson, Sebastian Petty, Seamus Heaney, and Tasha Bartholomew have been extremely helpful. We look forward to continuing the positive relationship of Caltrain and bikes to electrification and beyond. If you have any questions, please contact our Policy Manager, Emma Shlaes, at emma@bikesiliconvalley.org. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Shiloh Ballard
President and Executive Director
Please increase the number of bike spots available on the new electrified trains.

One of the biggest blockers to more people using Caltrain is the proximity between people's homes and workplaces to Caltrain stations. It's rare that someone both lives and works within walking distance. Allowing bikes on board is a great way to increase accessibility to public transportation.

Regards,
Ania Mitros
Mountain View resident
Attached are the recommendations from Bike San Mateo County on bicycle accommodation for the EMU cars and additional refinements to increase bicycle usage for station access.

If you have any questions please contact us.

Sincerely

Steve Vanderlip
June 2, 2015

Dear Chair Tissier and Directors;

BikeSanMateoCounty, the recognized grass-roots bicycle coalition of San Mateo County, would like to thank you for considering our proposal to shape the future of bicycle carriage on the proposed electrified Caltrain system. We would like to take the opportunity to not only suggest EMU configuration quotas, but also provide support to policy changes that might serve to increase utilization of at-station bicycle parking strategies.

We support Caltrain’s bikes on-board policy because it provides a proven and cost effective method of first and last mile accessibility at both ends of the train by reducing demand for a matching increase in parking space, buses, shuttle or other expensive methods to complete riders’ trips.

According to numerous Reports and Plans, to include Caltrain Modernization, Station Access, 2014 Strategic Plans, we note that 32% of passengers accessing Caltrain by bike should be set as a goal for Caltrain as a transit agency to achieve by 2020. With the current on-board ratio at 10:1 which will be changed to 9:1 when the third bike cars are added to the Bombardier train-sets this year, Caltrain has no plan to increase that ratio with any projected future ridership growth. Foregoing the already acknowledged discussion of how bump rates affect the reliability and dependability of service we are asking Caltrain to set clear, specific strategies of how the 32% goal will be met through:

- 16% bike space onboard (1.6 times more than today)
- 16% bike parking and bike share (sixteen times more than today)

We would see today’s 11% capacity accommodating a fairer share of bicycle passengers in matched future projections with an increase to 16% on-board space. Further, we ask that EMU design should include convertible space to allow ready expansion of bike capacity to 20% to meet latent demand and future growth beyond 2020. We understand that electrification will bring a cap of 6 trains per hour in each direction which allows us to suggest a final cap of on-board service at 20% with the caveat that Caltrain does not increase train-set and/or platform lengths, nor remove its 6 tph cap.

Caltrain should change its vision from being a railroad to being a public transit system and adjust its standee capacity ratio to reflect that of a public transit system. Currently Caltrain wants every passenger to have a seat or at least close with a 1:2 ratio. Public transit systems allow for a much higher ratio of 1:5. Caltrain should design for increased standee capacity, then utilizing the captured space to accommodate 20% bike capacity while maintaining the same or higher per car passenger capacity.

According to Caltrain’s data only about 1% of passengers currently park a bike at the station. The primary reasons are (1) no secure parking with racks, and (2) underutilization of existing keyed bike lockers due to poor subscription management (50% remain empty while wait list requests are ignored) and lack of maintenance. Before it upgrades parking,
Caltrain should inventory and provide prompt access to its existing lockers. It should not install, but in fact, remove most outdoor racks because it has no real theft reporting policy in place.

Criterion for recommending a 16% increase in bike park and bike share is that provision of enhanced and increased bike parking facilities complements higher housing density (TOD) near the stations, the push for better roads accessing the stations and could result in increased bike parking at the stations because Caltrain would capture a new bicycle sector where first and last mile considerations may be negligible.

It is our recollection that the 2008 Bicycle Access and Parking Plan, a perfectly acceptable blueprint outlining the above, cost about a quarter million dollars to produce, and now there is talk of funding a “Bicycle Parking Management Plan”, another Consultancy Firm expenditure for an unspecified amount, even after the BAPP has been under review for implementation since early 2013. We cannot endorse further expenditure for yet another Plan that may well gather dust for years as happened to the BAPP. Rather we look to develop robust bike parking facilities and plan for the expansion of bike share to encourage more people who complete the first and last mile to Caltrain by bike to have a viable alternative to bringing their bikes onboard by dedicating significant resources to that end.

We suggest that is it time to appoint a “Bicycle Policy Czar”, a la BART’s Steve Beroldo - Manager Access Programs, to be versed in all things bicycle in order to pull together all the disjointed data, declarations, policy guidelines, etc., that are now accessed by the public, as well as staff and the Board through piecemeal inspection of the numerous Plans and Programs and other documents in the vast Caltrain library arcana. That Czar would be responsible for producing a document that specifies Policy, Guidelines, and Practices for every aspect of operations in regard to Caltrain’s Bicycle Constituency of passengers. We feel comfortable in recommending Sebastian Petty for that position because not only has he given the BAPP close scrutiny for the past 2 years, but he has shown that he can work with other staff as well as the members of the BAC.

Thank you for your consideration.

With regard,

Steve Vanderlip
Dear Chair Tissier and Directors of the Joint Powers Board,

It would be a grave mistake to follow staff’s recommendation and not increase bike capacity onboard electrified Caltrain. Staff’s recommendation would put unnecessary pressure on expensive parking lots and heavily-subsidized feeder buses and shuttles from bicyclists who would be forced to use an alternate first and/or last mile connection. Even worse, many bicyclists would abandon Caltrain completely and simply drive alone instead, costing Caltrain ridership and revenue.

Our recommendation is to increase bike capacity in two steps as follows:

   Step 1: Provide 16% bike capacity on EMUs when Caltrain electrifies in 2020.
   Step 2: Increase bike capacity on EMUs to 20% in 2022.

Both steps 1 and 2 need to be included in EMU design: step 1 as bike space in the new EMUs, and step 2 as conversion compatible space in the new EMUs.

We acknowledge that without longer trains, adding more bike space before electrification would be difficult. Therefore, the next opportunity for an increase in bike capacity is EMUs in 2020, and at least 16% bike capacity will be needed by that time. It is expected to take a couple years for new customers to discover they won’t get bumped and switch their daily commutes to bike/train commutes, but by 2022, we anticipate Caltrain will need 20% bike capacity to meet demand.

Caltrain has increased bike capacity more than 50% in the last six years, and the new capacity has been entirely consumed as shown by the high incidence of bicycle bumps. We are requesting less than 50% increase five years from now on EMUs.

We understand that trains have limited onboard space and some trade-offs must be made to accommodate all passengers. We encourage staff to look at the big picture, not just floor space onboard the trains. A bike on the train eliminates a car parked all day long on some of the most expensive real estate in the country. A bike on the train saves a seat on a heavily subsidized feeder bus or shuttle. When all costs are considered, a bike on the train is a cost-effective solution to the first AND last mile problem.

We encourage Caltrain to add more standing space on EMUs. Caltrain’s 2015 passenger counts show that customers are willing to stand on Caltrain, but they are not willing to be left behind on the platform with their bicycles. Bicycle bumps more than tripled in 2015 compared with 2014 (data from Caltrain annual passenger counts), causing bike boardings to fall off their upward trend. In contrast, walk-on boardings continued their upward trend, despite some commute-period trains having standing room only, showing that passengers are willing to stand on Caltrain. Caltrain customers would much rather stand on the trains being transported to their destinations than stand on the platforms going nowhere.

Most people will walk up to half a mile to the station, but a bicycle expands that range to three miles, increasing accessibility by 16-fold. Bicycling to Caltrain benefits everyone by reducing traffic congestion, reducing pollution, saving fossil fuel, and improving public health. To encourage more people to access Caltrain by bicycle, our main focus is to advocate for an increase in onboard bike capacity to 16% by 2020, but we also support an increase in bike parking options to enable an additional 16% of passengers to park their bikes at stations.
The attached Powerpoint presentation provides more details on ridership projections and benefits of bikes onboard.

Please consider all costs when specifying EMU design. First and last mile costs should not be ignored, and a bicycle is the second most economical access mode behind walking. Please increase bike capacity to 16% in 2020 and 20% in 2022. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Shirley Johnson
Leader, BIKE'S ONboard project
The BIKEs ONboard project started in early 2008. Shirley Johnson leads the project as a volunteer. Our objective is to work with Caltrain to improve its onboard bicycle service.

There are many volunteers who have worked on this project over the years, too many to name. Dedicated bicycle commuters have volunteered countless hours of their time for this effort, because we believe that Caltrain’s onboard bicycle service is truly wonderful and we want to see it thrive.
Here is an outline of this presentation.

Outline

- History of bikes onboard Caltrain
- Bicycle bumps
- Projections for Caltrain bike ridership
- Benefits of 20% bike capacity
- Ranked priorities for electrified trains
- Summary
There has been a long history of incremental improvements toward better bicycle access onboard Caltrain. In 1992, eight bikes were allowed per train.

The service proved to be popular, so bike capacity was increased to 24 bikes per train in 1996.

By 2002, bike capacity was maxed out, so Caltrain increased bike space to 32 bikes per train on gallery trains. Caltrain put new Bombardier trains into service in 2002, but the Bombardier bike cars held only 16 bikes. Some trains had one bike car and some had two, so bike capacity among trains varied from 16 to 64 bikes per train. Customers never knew which train would show up, which made it uncertain whether customers with bikes would be allowed to board or not.

Bicycle bumps became a huge problem, and Caltrain addressed this in 2009 by increasing bike capacity to 40 bikes per gallery bike car and 24 bikes allowed on Bombardier bike cars; all Bombardier trains upgraded to two bike cars. Gallery trains still had either one or two bike cars, so bike capacity varied from 40 to 80 bikes per train. Consistency was better than before, but service was still unpredictable with many bicyclists continuing to get bumped.

In 2011, Caltrain upgraded all gallery trains to two bike cars, and scheduled specific train types on specific runs. This helped bicyclists know what to expect, so they could better estimate their chances of being allowed to board. But service disruptions can result in train swaps, and sometimes a Bombardier train (with 48 bike spaces) replaces a gallery train (with 80 bike spaces), leading to many bicycle bumps. Plus Bombardier trains are typically scheduled on baby bullet runs, the most desirable trains, systematically excluding bicyclists.

At the Joint Powers Board meeting on January 8, 2015, staff announced that all Bombardier trains will be upgraded to three bike cars. This is a slight increase in bike capacity of just 8%, not enough to eliminate all bicycle bumps, but at least all trains will be more consistent with 72 to 80 bikes per train. The 16 new Bombardier cars will add over 15% more seats to the fleet, addressing the needs of all passengers.
Caltrain customers voluntarily report bumps by email to the Joint Powers Board. We compile these bump reports and graph them as shown here. We started compiling bump reports in February 2009. Not all bumps are reported, so the graph shows the minimum number of bumps that occurred each month.

Caltrain added bike capacity in late 2009, and bumps dropped briefly, but service was still inconsistent with 40 to 80 bikes per train. Bumps were back up again later in 2010.

Caltrain upgraded all trains to two bike cars in 2011, and bumps dropped off in 2012, but bumps never went down to zero.

The spike in October 2012 is when Caltrain changed its schedule. Bombardier trains and gallery trains were switched on some runs, leading to more bumps when a Bombardier train with 48 bike spaces unexpectedly showed up in place of a gallery train with 80 bike spaces. Bicyclists had to adjust their schedules to accommodate the changes in equipment, and then bumps decreased the next month.

Bumps are on the rise again in 2014. In fact, September 2014 set a record high for reported bumps.

Bicycle bumps cause Caltrain service to be unreliable. For those commuters who need to get to work on time, it’s not merely an inconvenience; it could cost them their jobs. We’ve received letters from many cyclists who said they went back to driving, because they couldn’t count on Caltrain.
This graph shows annual percentage change in Caltrain ridership. The data are taken from Caltrain February annual passenger counts.

Blue shows walk-on ridership and red shows bike ridership. Increase in bike ridership has outpaced increase in walk-on ridership. Even in 2010 during the recession when overall ridership decreased, bike ridership fell less than walk-on ridership. This emphasizes the popularity of Caltrain’s onboard bicycle service.

We use this data to make predictions for future ridership in the next slide. We chose data from the past six years, because Caltrain added bicycle capacity in 2009 and 2011. Therefore, growth in bicycle boardings since 2008 is more representative of actual demand than prior years, when bicycle capacity was even more restricted. Over the past six years, February annual passenger counts show:

Average annual increase in weekday walk-on boardings = 5.5%
Average annual increase in weekday bicycle boardings = 17.1%

Bike ridership is Caltrain’s fastest growing customer segment, increasing 147% since 2008 while walk-on ridership increased only 35%.

It is remarkable that Caltrain bike ridership continues to increase, despite the high number of bicycle bumps. February 2014 passenger counts showed that over 11% of passengers bring a bike onboard and a Caltrain survey (published in the EIR for electrification) showed that 13% of passengers bring a bike onboard, whereas Caltrain has only 10% onboard bike capacity. This suggests that bicyclists are adjusting their commutes to take shoulder period trains, just so they can bring their bikes onboard.
This graph shows the percentage of passengers who bring a bike onboard Caltrain. The red line shows actual percentage of bike ridership from Caltrain’s February annual passenger counts, and the dashed gray line shows projected bike ridership.

We created this graph by extrapolating the average increases in ridership from the previous slide. Over 20% of Caltrain passengers are expected to bring a bike onboard electrified trains, assuming there is sufficient onboard bike capacity. The projection of 20% bike ridership in 2021 is low, however, because:

(1) Currently onboard bicycle space is limited, forcing many bicyclists back into their cars due to the high frequency of bumping. The annual increase in bicycle boardings would have been even higher than 17.1%, if Caltrain had had sufficient onboard bike space.

(2) February passenger counts severely understate bicycle boardings in warmer months, when bicycle boardings increase over 42% whereas walk-on boardings increase only 11% according to a comparison of Caltrain February 2004 with October 2004 passenger counts (2004 is the only year Caltrain conducted its passenger count twice).

These two points emphasize that bike capacity for 20% of passengers to bring a bike onboard electrified trains is considered a minimum.

These projections are based on an extrapolation, and extending the extrapolation would eventually predict that 100% of passengers would bring a bike onboard, which is not realistic. Bike ridership will eventually flatten out. We believe the extrapolation to 2021 is reasonable, however, because it is well below the theoretical maximum of 40% (see calculations for theoretical maximum at https://www.sfbike.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/2008-Caltrain-BOBreport.pdf).

We’ll adjust the projection as new data become available. At the current time, however, 20% is the best estimate we have.
Higher ridership is expected on electrified trains, and station access is a big consideration. Twenty percent bike capacity would promote mode shift from driving to biking. Many Caltrain parking lots are located on valuable downtown real estate, and some are already full today. Local residents suffer from Caltrain riders taking limited parking spaces on surface streets, especially acute at 22nd Street due to no Caltrain parking lot. The only way to increase parking at most stations would be to build multi-level parking structures at a cost of over $30,000 per parking space, and an unsightly parking garage would not be welcomed by most local residents. Twenty percent bike capacity would reduce the need for expensive parking facilities and help Caltrain’s image with people living near stations, because less parking would be required and traffic congestion would be reduced.

Twenty percent bike capacity would also reduce traffic congestion on freeways, because many bike-on-board customers choose to drive alone if they are not able to bring their bikes onboard Caltrain. Another benefit is lower fossil fuel consumption to reduce our dependence on oil.

Bicycling reduces carbon emissions compared with motorized transportation, and California has mandates to reduce emissions, a leading cause of climate change. Less pollution and more exercise means healthier people, saving health care costs.

Bicycling to Caltrain costs less than other station access modes including buses, shuttles, and driving. All public transportation is subsidized, but a bike space onboard the train is subsidized less than seats on buses or shuttles (see https://www.sfbike.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/2008-Caltrain-BOBreport.pdf). Twenty percent bike space on the train would reduce the need for additional feeder buses and shuttles. We encourage Caltrain to do a thorough analysis of the full cost of first- and last-mile connections to help guide future capacity planning.

Bicycle bumps have forced cyclists back into their cars. With 20% bike capacity, bicyclists could count on getting on the train, so those who have abandoned Caltrain would return and new customers with bicycles would embrace Caltrain as a reliable commute method, increasing ridership and ticket revenue.
With electrification, we have an opportunity to design bikes into the system instead of doing expensive retrofits later. This prioritized list is our “wish list” for bikes onboard, ranked from highest priority to lowest priority.

Comments on specific items:

3. No charge for bikes. Some people suggest that passengers should pay extra to bring their bikes onboard. Bicycling to and from stations should be encouraged due to economic, environmental, and social benefits, so charging to dissuade people from bringing their bikes onboard is counterproductive. Trumping that, however, is that state law prohibits charging extra for luggage or bikes.

4. Seats reserved for cyclists within sight of bikes is important for cyclists to guard their bikes against theft or damage.

5. Consistent bike capacity in every car has three main advantages: (1) distributes bicycle boardings at all doors, which can reduce dwell time when there are many cyclists boarding at a given station, (2) ensures all trains will have bike space irrespective of train length – particularly important in the event Caltrain runs shorter trains midday by decoupling some cars; EMUs make that easier to do as they are independently powered, and (3) simplifies operations, because there is no need to place specific cars at specific locations in the consist when all cars have essentially the same configuration.

10. Easily expandable onboard bike capacity to meet demand, up to 35% of passengers. Electrified trains will be around for many years, and 20% of passengers are expected to bring a bike onboard in 2021. We must be prepared for even more passengers wanting to bring a bike onboard in subsequent years. Current trains have easily expandable onboard bike capacity – seats can be replaced with bike racks. It may be as simple as that.
Caltrain’s bikes onboard service has economic, environmental, and social benefits. Caltrain is doing the right thing by continuing to expand the service.

Bicycling is increasingly popular, and as better bike infrastructure is put in place, even more people will ride. In Holland, for example, 40% of trips are taken by bike in some cities. San Francisco has a ways to go, with only 4% of trips taken by bike. We need to plan for the future of increasing bike ridership.

Caltrain’s onboard bicycle service is a godsend for those who don’t want to spend their time stuck in traffic on 101. Bringing a bike onboard Caltrain is exceptionally popular, and Caltrain hasn’t been able to keep up with demand. Bicycle bumps are at an all-time high.

Projections based on Caltrain ridership data show that 20% of passengers are expected to bring a bike onboard electrified trains. It’s important that electrified car design takes this into consideration, because retrofits are expensive.

We encourage Caltrain to continue wayside improvements, so that people who don’t need their bikes at both ends of their commutes have a practical and safe alternative.

We have an opportunity to design bikes into the system now for electrified trains. Let’s not pass up that opportunity to make many happy customers!
Appendix
Added May 15, 2015

Relevant New Information
1. Electrification Survey Results
2. 2015 February Annual Passenger Counts
After we made our projection that 20% of passengers will bring their bikes onboard electrified Caltrain in 2021, some new information has become available. This slide shows results of a survey that Caltrain conducted in 2014 (for more survey results, see [link](http://www.caltrain.com/Assets/__Agendas+and+Minutes/JPB/Board+of+Directors/Presentations/2015/2015-02-05+JBP+BOD+PCEP+Qtrly+Update.pdf)). The survey is statistically invalid, so the numbers should be taken with a grain of salt. For example, forty-four percent of survey respondents brought their bikes onboard Caltrain, more than actually bring their bikes onboard. The good news from this survey is that some people said they would consider alternatives to bringing their bikes onboard. This survey suggests that about 50% of people might use an alternative.

Caltrain did another survey in 2007 that asked “Why do/did you bring your bike onboard?” Only 20% said they brought their bikes onboard due to unsatisfactory bike parking options (18%) or unaware of bike parking options (2%). So let’s say 20 to 50% of bikes-on-board passengers would be willing to use an alternative. That’s great, because that could potentially handle the over 40% increase in bike boardings in warmer months compared with February bike boardings, on which our projection for 2021 is based.

Caltrain has recently been awarded a grant to develop a bicycle parking management plan. As part of that grant, Caltrain plans to “understand the factors that influence [customers] to take their bikes on board.” We are also encouraging Caltrain to determine subsidies for all station access modes to assess the economic benefit of bikes onboard. Once this information becomes available, we may adjust our recommendation for onboard bike capacity, but as of today, our 20% estimate is the best we have.
Caltrain released results of its 2015 February annual passenger counts last month. Caltrain counts bicycle bumps on a subset of trains, and this graph shows bicycle bumps counted as a function of year. There was a huge increase in bicycle bumps in 2015 due to bike capacity being completely maxed out. Bicycle bumps force bicyclists back into their cars costing Caltrain ridership and ticket revenue. This is illustrated by the next graph.
This graph shows the percentage increase in Caltrain boardings relative to 2010. Both bike boardings and walk-on boardings were increasing approximately linearly until 2015, when bike boardings fell off.

In contrast, walk-on boardings continued their same upward trajectory. Some trains have standing room only during commute periods, but limited seating capacity did not dampen walk-on boardings. This shows that customers are willing to stand on Caltrain.

However, customers are not willing to be bumped and left behind on the platform. They’ll abandon Caltrain and find an alternative commute method; most will just drive instead. Caltrain will lose over half a million dollars in ticket revenue in 2015 due to insufficient onboard bike capacity.

We’re thrilled that Caltrain plans to add a third bike car to Bombardier trains to reduce bicycle bumps and bring bicycling customers back. Bike boardings should come back up after the third bike car is added in late 2015.

As you can imagine, by 2021 and probably before, we’ll be in a similar situation we are today with insufficient bike capacity forcing bicyclists back into their cars. That’s why it’s so important that electrified trains have space to allow 20% of passengers to bring their bikes onboard to meet latent demand and to provide space for continued growth.
Appendix Summary

The new information supports 20% of passengers bringing their bikes onboard electrified Caltrain.
Dearest Caltrain,

I live 2 miles from the downtown Mountain View stop, work 4 miles from the California Avenue stop, and have friends, doctor appointments, meetings, and social engagements up and down the corridor.
I absolutely love Caltrain and the fact that I can ride my bike to the station, hop on board, and climb back on my bike at the end of my ride to get to my destination.
It is such a fast, easy, and enjoyable transportation method.

However getting bumped because the bike car is full seriously ruins my day.
Whether it’s late for work, missing a doctor’s appointment that I’d booked months in advance and having to pay in full anyways, or having to hop on my bike and pedal as hard as I can to ride that extra 5 miles and arrive to that meeting dripping sweat and feeling beyond unprofessional; it makes me question my choice to live car free and support alternative transportation every time.

Please please please increase bike capacity on electrified trains to accommodate the growing demand.
We need to be encouraging MORE Caltrain riders, not less.
I want to live in a world where MORE people ride their bikes and use your awesome rail service instead of driving cars.
Our community will be a better place for it.

With love and public transit evangelism,
Amber Lucas, Mountain View

Amber Rose Lucas | Sr. Program Manager, Propulsion Systems | Tesla Motors
To Whom It May Concern,

At its May 2015 meeting, the Bicycle Advisory Committee to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors has passed resolution concerning the future capacity of electric Caltrain lines.

Please see "Resolution Calling for Electrified Caltrain to Provide Capacity to Permit 20% of Passengers to Bring Their Bikes on Board," attached.

Sincerely,

- 
  Kevin Dole
  Secretary
  San Francisco Bicycle Advisory Committee
  http://www.sfgov.org/BAC
RESOLUTION CALLING FOR ELECTRIFIED CALTRAIN TO PROVIDE BIKE CAPACITY TO PERMIT 20% OF PASSENGERS TO BRING THEIR BIKES ONBOARD

WHEREAS, Caltrain, the San Francisco Peninsula rail transit service, provides a vital public transportation link serving the City and County of San Francisco and has provided onboard carriage of bicycles since 1992, and

WHEREAS, Caltrain's onboard bicycle service allows passengers to reach their origin stations and their final destinations without using motorized transportation on both ends of their commutes, taking the burden off heavily subsidized feeder buses and shuttles, and

WHEREAS, Caltrain's onboard bicycle service is socially and economically beneficial in eliminating reliance on the automobile, thereby effecting reductions in petroleum use, traffic congestion, pollution; and the impact of global warming, and

WHEREAS, Caltrain's onboard bicycle service reduces demand for expensive new parking lots or parking structures, and Caltrain predicts that a number of its parking lots will be unable to handle demand after Caltrain has been electrified, and

WHEREAS, Caltrain's onboard bicycle service encourages bicycling, which provides health benefits to communities by reducing both air pollution and noise pollution, and bicycling provides health benefits to riders through exercise to help curb the steep rise in maladies such as hypertension, diabetes, and obesity in America today; and

WHEREAS, Caltrain's onboard bicycle service is so popular today that customers with bicycles routinely get left behind on the platform or 'bumped' due to insufficient onboard bike capacity, and

WHEREAS, bicycle bumps force bicyclists back into their cars, costing Caltrain ridership and ticket revenue, and

WHEREAS, despite bicyclists being routinely bumped while all walk-on passengers are allowed to board, bikes-on-board passengers are Caltrain's fastest growing passenger segment: since 2008, bike boardings have increased 160% while walk-on boardings have increased only 50%, and

WHEREAS, 13% of Caltrain passengers currently bring their bicycles onboard while 1% park their bikes at the stations, according to Caltrain's Environmental Impact Assessment for Electrification, and

WHEREAS, bike parking using existing technology at Caltrain stations is underutilized as shown by Caltrain's survey of bike parking in 2012: the bike cage at Menlo Park was 61.9% in use, bike lockers in Palo Alto were 45.7% in use, and bike lockers in Mountain View were 60.3% in use, and
WHEREAS, even though alternatives to bringing a bike onboard exist, over 90% of bicycling customers bring their bikes onboard Caltrain today, and

WHEREAS, Caltrain plans to electrify its line by 2021 and is in the midst of designing new rail cars for electrification, but the allocation of floor space to store bicycles onboard has not yet been determined, and

WHEREAS, Caltrain’s February annual passenger counts from 2008 to 2014 extrapolated to 2021 show that over 20% of Caltrain passengers are expected to bring their bikes onboard in 2021, and

WHEREAS, the estimate of 20% of passengers bringing their bikes onboard in 2021 is considered conservative, because this estimate is based on extrapolating historical bike boardings suppressed due to both bicycle bumps and counts collected in February, a time of low bike ridership, and

WHEREAS, bike boardings in October are over 42% higher than bike boardings in February, according to a comparison of Caltrain’s annual passenger counts conducted in February and October, 2004, the only year Caltrain counted passengers twice, and

WHEREAS, wayside improvements such as electronic lockers, staffed bike parking, and bike share may offset the underestimate in projected bike boardings in 2021,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the San Francisco Bicycle Advisory Committee recommends that Caltrain provides sufficient space onboard electrified trains to allow 20% of passengers to bring their bikes onboard, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the San Francisco Bicycle Advisory Committee encourages Caltrain to improve and expand wayside amenities to enable those who do not need to bring their bikes onboard to leave their bikes at the stations.

Submitted and adopted on May 18, 2015

Approved by unanimous consent in attendance:

District 1: Kevin Dole (Absent)
District 2: Winston Parsons (Absent)
District 3: Marc Brandt
District 4: Edward Nicholson
District 5: Morgan Fitzgibbons
District 6: Richard May
District 7: Bert Hill
District 8: Diane Serafini (Recused)
District 9: Ilyse Magy
District 10: (Open)
District 11: Casey Allen (Absent)

Signed Bert Hill, Chair Date 5/18/2015
Please find attached, the above referenced resolution for consideration by the Caltrain Directors.

Regards,

Bert Hill, Chair
SF Bicycle Advisory Committee
415-672-3458 Mobile/Text
Hi,

I am writing to express my concerns about Caltrain's intention not to increase capacity for bicycles on Caltrain's upcoming electrified system. I live in Palo Alto and commute via bicycle and Caltrain to San Francisco daily for work. I really appreciate the service that Caltrain provides; I get exercise commuting to and from the train station and, when on board the train, I have an opportunity to relax and catch up on work.

Passengers with bicycles are Caltrain's fastest growing customer segment and commuting via Caltrain and bicycle is a great way to get exercise, reduce our impact on the environment and avoid the stress and wasted time of driving. Although I understand that Caltrain must balance the needs of all passengers, both with and without bicycles, I feel like passengers with bicycles are being done a disservice by not planning for their inevitable increase in ridership over the coming years.

In the past, I have attempted to board Caltrain #323 at Palo Alto to travel to the city, but having gotten bumped so often, I gave it up in favor of boarding at California Ave on a limited train instead. Bumps like these will become only more frequent over the years. Caltrain has the ability to foresee this increase in passenger inconvenience and to correct it in advance. If Caltrain could increase bicycle capacity by 20% to accommodate growing demand, I and your other current and future bicycle-equipped passengers would greatly appreciate it.

Thank you,
Daniel Golden
Palo Alto
Caltrain commuter since 2013
Hello,

I use Caltrain for my standard commute, from San Mateo to San Francisco. At both ends, I am approximately 2 miles from the train station. With a bike, this distance is quite trivial, but if I had to walk the distance, I would have to rely upon driving. I very much appreciate having my bike on Caltrain to address the "last mile".

I was informed that staff is recommending the same bike capacity for electrified service in 2020. While bike support in 2015 is far better than several years ago, back in 2009 when I regularly started using Caltrain for my commute, I still get bumped from being able to take my bike on many of the train routes. In fact, I can only guarantee that I'll be able to take my bike if (a) I commute outside of standard commute hours and (b) there is no SF Giants game. The bike service is far better than it was, but still insufficient to address the last mile effect mentioned earlier. With growth estimations as they are, 2020 must certainly presume significant increases in Caltrain adaption, for daily commutes. Even if there were no increase in adaption, we would still need perhaps another bike car on the train. With those adoptions, I suspect even one train is insufficient.

It would be ideal if Caltrain could bump its bike capacity to at least 20% beyond what it currently is, when addressing the capacity of electrified trains.

Being a resident of San Mateo, I feel that the Caltrain is fundamental to me, when I consider public transportation options. I typically use Caltrain only to travel to SF, where parking is limited. However, if the bicycle were guaranteed to be accepted on board, I would use Caltrain when traveling to so many more destinations, such as San Jose for Sharks games or to check out the Tech museum.

Thank you!

Regards,

Mike Williamson
(San Mateo resident)
To the board:

I bike to Caltrain (22nd St./Bayshore – Palo Alto) as part of my commute, and I am lucky to be able to adjust my work schedule on most days to avoid the busiest peak hour trains, where the risk of bumps makes it impossible for me to plan around a specific arrival time. However for those days when I have to use peak hour trains, it is seeming increasingly clear that I will need to find a way to commute down the peninsula by car as the use of Caltrain’s limited peak hour bike capacity continues to climb. I am glad to hear that progress is being made with the additional capacity that’s coming this year, but I urge you to continue adding capacity to meet demand with the transition to electric trains.

I appreciate that you are working to provide a usually-fantastic service with very limited resources. Thank you.

Sam Bowman
Stanford University
San Francisco
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>From:</strong></th>
<th>Jeff Munos <a href="mailto:jeffmunos@gmail.com">jeffmunos@gmail.com</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sent:</strong></td>
<td>Thursday, May 28, 2015 11:35 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To:</strong></td>
<td>Board (@caltrain.com)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cc:</strong></td>
<td><a href="mailto:bikesonboard@sfbike.org">bikesonboard@sfbike.org</a>; Nabong, Sarah; Murphy, Seamus; cacsecretary (@caltrain.com); Caltrain, Bac (@caltrain.com)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject:</strong></td>
<td>Please expand the bike capacity on the electrified trains</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is very frustrating to be bumped due to not enough bike capacity.
Hi,

I'd like to ask you to plan for more passengers bringing bikes on board caltrain on your electrified trains in 2020. I've been bumped from trains several times.

Ziyan
Hello Caltrain Board,

I've been bringing my bike on the train for my daily commute from 22nd St to San Antonio for two years now and overall it has been a great service. My one complaint would be the lack of capacity, which is why it's very discouraging to hear recommendations against increasing bike capacity when the new electrified system goes in.

With the Bay Area population increasing every day along with increased bike usage and urbanization the demand for bike space on the train will only rise. It happens all to often that a new system gets implemented and there are immediate complaints because growth and trends weren't accounted for, which is why it's important to look ahead at ridership when planning the electrified train system.

I assume that a plan that's set to begin in 5 years will at least be looking a decade past that, which is why an increase in overall bike capacity of 20% is undoubtedly a necessity if Caltrain wants to maintain the level of ridership it enjoys now. The environmental, economic, and social benefits of biking are well known and should be supported by all public transportation companies in the Bay Area.

Thanks for your consideration,
Trevor Martens
San Francisco
Dear Caltrain Board,

I'm a faithful Caltrain rider and have always been impressed with the reliable and comfortable service you provide. On my commute to work, I bike from my apartment near the panhandle in San Francisco to the 4th & King station. I don't own a car (and couldn't afford to), so I am thankful to have an option to bike to the train.

I read that bike passengers are the fastest-growing rider population, but that Caltrain staff has recommended the same bike capacity for the new electrified service in 2020. Though I recognize that Caltrain has to accommodate seated and standing passengers, it still doesn't seem logical to ignore a growing need for bike capacity in planning for the future. I've been bumped from the train because of full bike trains many times, and though I have no other option, it occurs to me that for a Caltrain rider with other options, getting bumped might incentivize them to revert to those alternatives. And not only might those alternatives decrease Caltrain ridership (and revenue), but they also have harmful environmental and social benefits-- more drivers means more cars, more congestion, and more CO2 emissions, not to mention the missed health benefits of biking.

So I'm writing to request that Caltrain increase bike capacity rather than keep it stagnant. I've read that to meet current demand and to allow for future growth, Caltrain needs to accommodate bike capacity 20% of its ridership, and that's my request. This would not only allow for the projected bike-on-board growth, but would decrease the rate of bike bumps as that growth continues.

Thank you for taking my suggestion and thank you again for the excellent service!

Teresa Pratt
resident, San Francisco
Dear Caltrain,

Bikes are above capacity on the trains right now, so we need more space as ridership grows.

Thank you,
Zoe Hoster
Dear Caltrain Board,

I am a daily Caltrain rider commuting from Redwood City to San Francisco. I bike two miles on either end of this commute for a total of eight miles a day. For me, this is by far the best solution to get from Redwood City to San Francisco's Financial District. I also believe my commuting choice has benefits to the overall Bay Area transportation system. These include:

* Reduced need for parking at Caltrain parking lots
* Reduced need for additional public transportation in San Francisco
* Reduced carbon intensity related to my commute
* Reduced congestion on streets from personal cars and/or cabs/Uber's
* [Personal but included anyway] Health benefit of combining commute time with exercise

However, all these benefits only occur if there is space available for my bicycle on-board Caltrain. I have seen first hand the increased ridership over the past 2.5 years that I have been using Caltrain. While I could cite facts and figures, I would rather tell you that I have personally being bumped from many trains and the frequency of this occurrence is increasing. I have also noticed increased construction of high density housing within biking distance of Caltrain stations all along the Peninsula. I can only assume that a portion of these new residents will choose to use Caltrain's services.

I truly believe that designing a system to under-serve today's needs in the context of clearly growing demand is a mistake. Please reconsider increasing bike capacity on the new electric cars so Caltrain can continue to deliver a truly valuable service to their loyal riders and all Bay Area commuters.

Thank you,
-David Fisher
Hello,
My name is Ohad Barak. I'm a Stanford student and I regularly commute from my residence to Palo Alto station via Caltrain and a bicycle. This is by far the most efficient transportation method.
It has become increasingly difficult to board the train with a bicycle due to a more frequent lack in available bike racks on board the bike cars.

It has come to my understanding that as part of the future plans Caltrain is working on for the electrification of the trains, no additional bike capacity is being considered.
I would like to know why. From a business perspective, it seems rather counterintuitive that the largest growing population of Caltrain users should not be allowed to grow further.

If I were you, I would reconsider the matter, and recommend an increase in bike capacity on future cars.

Thank you,
Ohad Barak,
Mountain View,
CA
Dear Caltrain Board:

Please take into consideration a future just 5 years from now when even more passengers will need to bring bikes onboard in 2020 and increase bike capacity on electrified trains.

As a lifelong Caltrain cyclist (I first received a "permit" for the pilot, circa 1993/4, riding from SF to Hillsdale and back), I bring my bike onboard several times a week for my commute to/from San Carlos/Palo Alto, and often on the weekends and for special events with my family.

I'm disappointed that staff is recommending the same bike capacity for electrified service in 2020 as today - there will definitely be more bicyclists who need to bring their bikes onboard in 5 years. Some facts from your February annual passenger counts:

* Bikes-on-board passengers are Caltrain’s fastest growing customer segment: bike boardings increased 147% from 2008 to 2014, while walk-on boardings increased only 35%.
* Bicycle bumps increased 328% from 2014 to 2015.
* In 2008, 6% of Caltrain passengers brought their bikes onboard. In 2014, 11% of Caltrain passengers brought their bikes onboard. At that growth rate (suppressed by bicycle bumps), 16% of passengers will bring their bikes onboard electrified trains.
* Bicycle boardings increased 42% in October compared with February, whereas walk-on boardings increased only 11% (data from Caltrain’s 2004 passenger counts, the only year Caltrain counted twice).
* The average annual increase in bicycle boardings between 2008 and 2014 was over 17%, but the increase dropped to 5.7% in 2015 due to bicycle bumps. In contrast, the average annual increase for walk-on boardings was 5.5% between 2008 and 2014, but the increase jumped to 11% in 2015, even though some commute-period trains have standing room only.

I understand that Caltrain needs to balance seats, bike space, and standing space on new rail cars, but remember that bringing a bike onboard has economic, environmental, and social benefits (e.g., saves parking spaces in crowded parking lots, frees up seats on heavily subsidized feeder buses and shuttles, reduces traffic congestion, reduces pollution, improves public health).

**Please increase bike capacity on electrified trains to at least 20% to meet latent demand and allow for future growth.**

Thanks for your consideration,

Rich Schwerin
San Carlos
Twitter.com/Greencognito
LinkedIn.com/in/RichSchwerin
I have to begin by saying I love my commute from San Jose to Menlo/Palo Alto and that is made possible because I have Caltrain that supports my bike commuting on both ends of journey. I have been doing this commute for over 8 years (before that I commuted by train from San Carlos).

Over the years I have seen ridership increase; I recall the old days when there was only one bike car per train and I got bumped a few times. Caltrain increased capacity and that did not happen for a while; although, it has not happened to me, lately I have seen people being left behind on the Bombadier trains which only carry 48 bikes. If it wasn't for the generosity of some of the conductors who allowed excess bikes, I too would of been left behind on many occasions.

I am actually stunned that I am hearing that there is a proposal for not increasing bike capacity when the trains are electrified. Right now a bike capacity of 48 is insufficient; the older trains with 80 bikes on occasion are quite packed. I don't have to be a rocket scientist to see with the way the Bay area is growing that capacity of 80 bikes will soon too not be enough. I sincerely hope that Caltrain continues to expand the bike capacity going forward; having to use my bike at both ends, I don't know how I would commute as the uncertainty getting left behind at a train station is a pain and kills the benefits of using Caltrain.

Sincerely,
Chris Holland
Hello,

I wanted to express my continued appreciation that Caltrain leads the way in supporting the use of both bicycles and public transportation with its innovative bikes on board policy. Caltrain's board had the vision of an integrated bike and public transportation system significantly before other regional public transportation agencies and Caltrain serves as a model nationwide.

In light of Caltrain's forward thinking history with respect to bicycle use on the Caltrain system, I find it puzzling and alarming that the board at Caltrain has failed to include increased bicycle capacity as a feature of electrified cars on the trains that will begin running in five short years. I live in San Francisco and have made the Caltrain-bicycle commute for the past 10 years from San Francisco to Redwood City. The growth in the need for bicycle access to Caltrain has increased substantially in the years that I have used Caltrain, and the Caltrain passenger only needs to look out of the Caltrain window to realize that the demand for bicycle access will accelerate after Caltrain electrifies the rails. From the area in San Francisco where the future trans-bay terminal is being constructed, through the former San Mateo fairgrounds, downtown Redwood City, and the Silicon Valley high tech corridor of jobs, the Caltrain route is lined with high density development projects that will house the next generation of transplanted residents to the Bay Area. The high rise condominium and apartment infrastructure along the Caltrain lines will be superimposed on an existing infrastructure of suburban sprawl mixed with technology business industrial parks that will span from the south Bay north through the Peninsula. The reality of the future is that a majority of new residential and work options for Bay area residents will limit their use of a car, but will often require their use of a bicycle to navigate the existing suburban landscape in order to get to and from Caltrain stations and where they work and live.

Please, please, please consider increasing the proposed capacity of bicycle access to the Caltrain electrified trains that are anticipated to start running in 2020. Capacity providing access to 20 percent of Caltrain boarding to passengers with bicycles is a realistic number to anticipate for future trains. I encourage the board to anticipate standing room scenarios similar to those observed during the past year within a shorter period of time than you may be expecting after Caltrain electrifies the rails and the high speed corridor rail lines begin operating. To borrow a trite movie phrase, "If you build it, he (they) will come." Caltrain will again become filled beyond capacity with both cyclist and non-cyclist passengers, so planning for open spaces that can accommodate both the increased cycling use and that can be adapted as standing room space for crowded commute hours is the prudent thing for Caltrain to do.

Please, continue to be the leader in innovation and vision that we have come to expect of your organization!

Scott Yarbrough
San Francisco resident, Peninsula employee
Now, and in the electrified future! That concise enough?

Many thanks,

-John
Dear Caltrain Board,

I’m writing to you today because I wanted to say thank you for continuing to allow bikes aboard trains. It’s a critical part of my commute and allows my family to own just a single car instead of two.

While I’m excited about the future electrification plans (additional trains, faster service) I’ve heard that the current proposal doesn’t add any additional bike capacity to trains. Bikes on Caltrain is one of the fastest growing customer segments, growing 147% between 2008 and 2014. I realize that you need to balance various tradeoffs when designing the layouts of the new trains but riders with bikes offer additional benefits to Caltrain. They reduce the demand for the already limited parking at stations and they free up seats on the station shuttles.

I’d really like to see Caltrain increase the bike capacity between 16-20% on electrified trains. That should allow for the growth in ridership in the coming years and encourage those who have been bumped to return with their bikes.

Thank you for considering my input,
Matt Colyer
Redwood City, CA
Hello,

I am writing to urge you to increase bike capacity on electrified trains. If the number of people with bikes on CalTrain continues to increase (as it has in the past year), and I continue to get bumped, I will have to stop taking CalTrain altogether and return to using my car. This would be a shame, as I really enjoy my train/bike commute!!

I'm very disappointed that the current recommendation is for the same amount of bike capacity—surely you want to invest the future of your riders by increasing bike capacity? There is undoubtedly sufficient capacity for everyday passengers, so I simply don't understand why you would convert some of that space into bike space.

I really hope this is not the case, and that you will provide extra bike space so I can continue using CalTrain!

Thank you,
Matthew Brouillard
Hi all,

Started riding my bike again seriously for commuting about 5 years ago. Caltrain has been an integral part of that. I currently live in Belmont, ride to Palo Alto, and then take Caltrain to San Jose where I work. Without Caltrain I could not ride my bike. Without my bike I could not take Caltrain. The two are inextricably linked as an alternative to driving. I need my bike on both sides of my Caltrain ride, and so must be able to take it on board.

I’ve seen a significant increase in the number of bike riders on board Caltrain in the past 5 years. I can only imagine that it will increase. I already see a fair number of folks bumped during peak hours. I can only imagine that too will increase.

Without bikes, the ability to use Caltrain is restricted to those who can walk to/from stations, those whose companies have shuttles, and those who can spare the time to take the bus (if there is one). Other folks are out of luck. Bikes dramatically increase the number of folks who can practically get from here to there on Caltrain. Caltrain should be embracing bikes, not begrudge bike riders space on board.

Even for folks who can use cars, buses, or shuttles to Caltrain, bikes offer many advantages. We open up seats on buses, we take cars off the roads, we don’t take up scarce Caltrain parking spots. Additionally, we reduce carbon emissions and encouraging riding helps folks stay healthy.

I understand that bikes on Caltrain may reduce seating a bit. This is more than compensated for by all the above benefits. Worst case, adding cars, or additional train runs could handle the extra capacity. In particular, extra runs would increase the ridership: it’s no big deal to wait 20 minutes for the next train. Waiting an hour is more than most folks are willing to do. Frequent trains means that folks don’t need to plan, then can just go to the station and wait for the next train. And bikes make this work better. You can’t run frequent trains stopping at every station. You can if they stop mostly at the major stations. On my bike, it’s easy for me to get to the major stations, no matter where I live.

Thanks much,

giuliano carlini
After several years of battling the 101 and 280, I recently made the switch to Caltrain with a SF-SJ ride with a 30-minute bike ride each way. I expect traffic on highways will get worse so offering the bike/Caltrain option makes so many improvements to life and the environment.

Please continue to increase your bike capacity.

Best regards,
Tim
Please increase bike capacity on electrified trains by 20%. It's always a tradeoff as to what to spend your money on, but encouraging bike passengers decreases road congestion & helps promote clean air & health lifestyles.

--
Vicki Pelton vpelton@vertical-edge.com
Redwood City, CA
I have been enjoying taking Caltrain to work with my bike as it's cold and dark in the morning. I ride my bike home after work and enjoy the Bay Trail, peace and quiet and my exercise while I alleviate some of the 101 congestion and pollution.

Unfortunately, the bullet train is very full and there is not enough space for all the bikes. I have gotten bumped which puts me at a bad position at work.

Caltrain should seriously think about drastically increase the bike capacity on the electrified trains in the future. Especially the bullet trains and rush-hour trains. The current situation is already overcrowded and it will only get worse.

Riding a bike to work, saves parking spaces, reduces traffic congestion, pollution and improves public health and stress.

I sincerely hope Caltrain will take a good look at all the positive facts that come from bringing bikes on the trains and will increase bike capacity.

Thank you

Residence of San Mateo

Lotti Dunbar
lottid@mac.com

electrified trains
To the Caltrain Board,

My name is Eric, and I'm a daily Caltrain bike commuter. I love biking and taking Caltrain. Caltrain's bike-friendly cars are vital to my daily commute -- without the ability to bring my bike onto Caltrain, I would certainly be driving to work every day.

I'm disappointed that Caltrain is recommending keeping bike capacity the same in 2020 as it is today. The biking commuter population is growing at a rapid rate, and Caltrain is choosing not to grow with it. Bikers will be bumped off of full trains -- as I already am a few times every month -- more and more as time goes on. As this happens more frequently, bikers will simply stop taking Caltrain, opting instead to drive.

Caltrain has been great for bikers. As the bike commuter community grows, so too should Caltrain's bike support. I am asking that Caltrain increase bike capacity by 20% on the new trains. This will help Caltrain remain a leader in bike-friendly commuting options around the world. The positive effects on the Bay Area at large will be countless -- reduced congestion, reduced pollution, happier commuters, just to name a few.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Eric Sadur
San Francisco, CA
Hello Caltrain Board,

My name is Alex Herzick and I commute to San Francisco from Menlo Park/Palo Alto with my bike on Caltrain. First I would like to thank Caltrain for including bike capacity on all the new Metrolink cars and am eager to see those cars adding to the trains soon. This increased bike capacity reduces bicycle bumps, improves consistency and service reliability, promotes bicycling instead of driving, reduces traffic and parking congestion, reduces air pollution, and serves a large portion of your constituency. This is why I am extremely disappointed that staff is recommending the same bike capacity for electrified service as the capacity that is in place today. I am asking Caltrain to increase bike capacity on electrified trains to 20% to meet latent demand and allow for future growth.

Given the current and projected growth rates for bike ridership (especially when compared to the walk-on boardings lower growth rate), Caltrain needs to increase bike capacity on electrified trains to accommodate this growing demand. Bikes-on-board passengers are Caltrain’s fastest growing customer segment: bike boardings increased 147% from 2008 to 2014, while walk-on boardings increased only 35%. Meanwhile, bicycle bumps increased 328% from 2014 to 2015- indicating the bike boarding growth rate would have been even higher had all bike passengers been allowed to board. In 2008, 6% of Caltrain passengers brought their bikes onboard. In 2014, 11% of Caltrain passengers brought their bikes onboard. At that growth rate (suppressed by bicycle bumps), 16% of passengers will bring their bikes onboard electrified trains. However given the high number of bumps, I expect that 20% of passengers will bring their bikes on board by 2020, assuming available capacity. Bicycle boardings increased 42% in October compared with February, whereas walk-on boardings increased only 11% (data from Caltrain’s 2004 passenger counts, the only year Caltrain counted twice). The average annual increase in bicycle boardings between 2008 and 2014 was over 17%, but the increase dropped to 5.7% in 2015 due to bicycle bumps and the bike cars being at capacity. In contrast, the average annual increase for walk-on boardings was only 5.5% between 2008 and 2014.

These facts provide strong evidence that bike ridership will continue to grow (faster than walk-on ridership) and that bike ridership is already at capacity, and as such capacity should be increased on the electrified trains versus capacity today. I understand that Caltrain needs to balance seats, bike space, and standing space on new rail cars, but as I mentioned before bringing a bike onboard has economic, environmental, and social benefits (e.g., saves parking spaces in crowded parking lots, frees up seats on heavily subsidized feeder buses and shuttles, reduces traffic congestion, reduces pollution, improves public health). I am asking Caltrain to increase bike capacity on electrified trains to 20% to meet latent demand and allow for future growth. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.
Best Regards,

Alex Herzick

Menlo Park

alex.herzick@gmail.com
Dear members of the board,

As a frequent Caltrain rider, I am always very happy to hear about progress in your efforts towards electrification. I am convinced the electrified Caltrain is a cornerstone of the Bay Area's future transportation plans. However, I am now disappointed and worried to hear that you are considering proposals not to increase bicycle capacity on the electrified Caltrain.

Caltrain is at its strongest when combined with bicycle transportation for the "last mile". I've been happy to see bicycle ridership on Caltrain grow significantly in recent years, and I am myself frequently among bicycle riders who use Caltrain to commute, or for leisure. To me, Caltrain's bicycle cars are indispensable.

In recent years, the number of "bicycle bumps" on Caltrain has been growing alarmingly. Despite earlier promises that the electrification project would bring relief, the latest news has it that you are considering not growing your bicycle carrying capacity at all. This worries me greatly; not only for my own commute, but especially also for your long-term business model.

As I am sure you are aware, bicycle ridership constitutes a quickly increasing percentage of your customer base. Furthermore, your ability to carry bicycles takes cars off the road and relieves overcrowded bus-lines. Those effects aren't only essential to your financial future, but in maintaining and building your political and societal support as well.

I am certainly aware of your need to balance various groups of riders when planning your business, and I understand that you frequently find yourself in a predicament as a result. Nevertheless, I urge you to greatly increase bicycle carrying capacity on Caltrain.

Increasing bicycle ridership on Caltrain benefits not only your bicycle-riding customers. The improved traffic and environmental factors that result benefit all of society, while you will find that bicycle riders can be your strongest advocates and most loyal customers.

Thank you for your invaluable contributions to Bay Area transit, and the community.

Best regards,
Robert-Jan Huijsman
Mountain View, CA.
Hi - for the past 18 years I have commuted 5 days a week from San Francisco to Menlo Park via Caltrain. Over this time, the bike cars have become so crowded. Its wonderful that so many folks are biking instead of diving (or taking google busses), getting bumped is a regular occurrence. but sometimes I get home from work an hour or two later than planned. Times when being late is not an option, I ask for a ride from a car driver at work.

Please consider increasing bike capacity to meet the increasing bike use, and keep the ridership that you have. We love Caltrain, we want to be able to use it!

Thank you, Tara Schraga
Dear Caltrain Board and Stakeholders:

As you are planning for the future of Caltrain by improving infrastructure and technology, I want to remind you that an essential piece of the puzzle that we are all solving for is long-term sustainability for our cities. Caltrain plays a key role, and cyclists are an important supporting factor. Bicycle commuters (like myself!) are a growing segment of the population, and will only increase if supported by appropriate infrastructure.

Right now, when I take my bike to the Caltrain station in the morning, I run the risk of missing an important meeting or having to wait if bumped. Bike bumps increased by more than 3x between 2014 and 2015. I even run the risk of unpleasant and aggressive behavior by poorly informed conductors. This is such a tragedy -- people increasingly want to do the right thing for the environment, for our roads and cities, for their health, and for all of our pocketbooks, but it seems that you are looking the other way.

There is an important opportunity now to increase bike capacity and I urge you to consider it strongly. Please increase bike capacity on electrified trains to 20%.

Sincerely,
Polina Feldman
Mountain View
To JPB BOD:

Thank you for leading Caltrain into the future. I’ve read summaries of the types of train cars you have to consider, with different lengths, capacities, door configurations, platform heights, fuel consumption and so on. There are many trade-offs to be made but one in particular that I’d like to highlight. Every time I ride Caltrain I bring my bicycle onboard so that I can easily and rapidly go the few miles at both ends of my trip. Being denied boarding due to limited capacity severely undermines my trust in Caltrain as a reliable means of transportation during rush hours. I see from the May 7 presentation that you are increasing the Bombardier bike capacity from 48 to 72 per train, thank you! But I also heard from Shirley Johnson that you are not planning to increase bicycle capacity in the new rolling stock and am quite disappointed. Caltrain's own survey shows that bike ridership has more than doubled in the past 5 years, even though cyclists are being denied boarding. I expect this growth to continue, reduced only when passengers rejected by denied boardings find other means of transportation.

I know you have many difficult decisions to make but please take this opportunity to increase bicycle capacity. It will reduce demand for station car parking and is very closely aligned with Caltrain's goal of getting cars off the road.

Sincerely,

Tom Brown
Dear Caltrain,

I love to ride Caltrain (I ride from SF 22nd street to Palo Alto and back daily), but it has gotten hard recently because there is often not space for my bike. Please expand bike capacity on Caltrain, and please plan to expand capacity on the electrified trains planned for 2020. Bikes are good for the planet, and good for Caltrain, and Caltrain should be a leader in accommodating bikes. They save space on parking, and take cars off the road. I bring my bike on board so that I don’t need to drive a car and park at the Caltrain station. Increasingly, however, I have been denied space on the train at 22nd street because the bike cars are full. This has gotten more common lately, and will likely be even more common in 2020, given the rapid increase in bikes on Caltrain in the last few years.

I hope you’ll expand the number of bike cars on the trains, particularly in the planning for the electrified trains planned for 2020.

Thanks

Sean.

(Resident, San Francisco).

_____________________________
Sean F. Reardon
Professor of Poverty and Inequality in Education
and Professor (by courtesy) of Sociology
Stanford University
CERAS Building, 520 Galvez Mall, #526
Stanford, CA 94305-3084
650.736.8517 (Office Phone)
650.723.9931 (Office Fax)
sean.reardon@stanford.edu
http://cepa.stanford.edu/sean-reardon
Good afternoon, Mr. Eliot. Your letter to the Caltrain Board of Directors and Caltrain Citizens Advisory Committee was referred to me for response. The Board and CAC members will receive a copy of our correspondence.

We regret that you were delayed getting to the CAC meeting because your desired train had reached its bike capacity. With our growing ridership, some customers are having similar experiences. We’ve just released a video informing customers of options to taking bikes onboard because of the limited capacity. You can see the video at www.caltrain.com/bicycles.

Staff working on the cars for an electrified Caltrain hasn’t determined how many bike spaces will be available per train. One of the challenges they are currently working on is the need to balance available capacity between customers who want to sit, bathroom availability and customers who want to bring their bikes onboard. I've shared your comments with the team working on the electric multiple units fleet, who will take them into consideration as they move forward with the various options. Staff is scheduled to provide information about the EMUs to the Board of Directors at its June 4 meeting.

Thank you for your comments and for choosing Caltrain as one of your commute modes.

Sincerely,

Rita

Rita P. Haskin
SamTrans | Caltrain | TA
Executive Officer, Customer Service and Marketing
1250 San Carlos Ave.
San Carlos, CA 94070-1306
650-508-6248
www.smctd.com

Dear Caltrain Board,

Yesterday I attended the Caltrain CAC meeting on proposed designs of the new EMUs. I intended to ask the CAC to consider how important it is to have adequate bike space in the new EMUs. Actually I got to the meeting about half an hour late instead of ten minutes early, which meant that I was unable to testify during the public comment period.

Why should my tardiness matter to you?

The reason I was late is that I was denied boarding train 269 in Menlo Park with my bike. How ironic. Basically, I was unable to comment on the adequacy of bike space on trains because the bike space on my train was inadequate.
My point is that bikes-on-board service isn’t really about counting “bumps”. It’s about people and predictability and dependability. I was depending on Caltrain to take me to the meeting. Because there’s not enough bike space, boarding is unpredictable. In retrospect I took a chance and Caltrain let me down. If people like me have to roll the dice every time they take the train, they will get very frustrated. I know I am. Bumps aren’t numbers, they are people. Each bump has a face. People have to get places and have important things to do. Unless you think that public comments at Caltrain meetings aren’t important.

I’ve been riding Caltrain with my bike since there was a single bike car on Gallery trains - I’m guessing nine or ten years. In that time I’ve seen demand for bikes-on-board continue to grow. There was a period in 2008 or 2009 when the likelihood of being bumped was huge. Then Caltrain responded with expanded capacity and dependability was good again. Now my feeling is that we’re back to the 2009 era. There are just tons of people who want to use the bikes-on-board service and I’m back to rolling the dice.

Within this context, Caltrain is now evaluating the design of new EMUs. One the of the EMU trade-offs I’ve heard results in fewer bike spaces per train than the current system. This is absolutely nuts! What successful organization looks at increasing demand from its clients and says let’s supply less of what they want?

Best Regards,
2015 JPB CAC Work Plan – Draft as of 6-17-15

May 20
- Budget process, funding, etc.
- CalMod Update EMU procurement and design considerations

June 17
- Annual Counts
- Bylaws subcommittee report and recommendations
- VTA schedule coordination
- EMUs Bikes/Bathrooms/Seats/Standees

July 15
- CalMod qtly update
- Bylaws changes
- High-speed rail update
- Service disruption discussion

August 19
- Service levels – How service levels are decided, when changes are made, what factors are involved
- Homeless encampments / right of way cleanup
- Rolling stock overview
- ADA improvements

September 16
- Caltrain Corridor tenants
- Quiet cars

October 21
- Cal Mod qtly update

November 18

December 16